A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF AL-BUKHĀRĪ AND AL-KULAYNĪ ALONG WITH THEIR CO-RELIGIONISTS REGARDING THE BASIC DOCTRINES OF ISLĀM

by

Khalid Mahmud

Re-submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Birmingham

October, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

Introduction 1

FOREWORD The authority of the Prophet in Islām and the authenticity of the hadith i-xxv

Chapter I:

The Historical Background of Sunnī and Shīʿī Disputes 6

1. The Qur'ānic prediction of doctrinal disputes 6

i. The following of the Mutashābihāt (the allegorical verses) of the Qur'an. 6

ii. The following of the parallel streams of thought. 10

iii. Men's being divided into sects explained in terms of God's chastisement. 11

2. The attitude of Islām in regard to the division of the Community 13

i. The Qur'ānic instruction not to divide into sects. 13

ii. The Prophet's disagreement with division into sects. 13

iii. The Companions' disagreement with division into sects. 14

(a) The differences among the Companions 15

(b) The implied meaning of the Companions' being in the right. 17

(c) The Shīʿī's disagreement with decision based on analogy. 18

3. The wave of political differences and their emergence in the doctrinal field 19

i. The Qur'ānic dictum for the transgressors. 21

ii. The Prophet's verdict in regard to the transgressors. 22

iii. How the political revolt provoked theological discussions. 23

iv. The spread of forgeries and the twofold image of ʿAlī 26

v. The two separate schools of knowledge and learning. 27

4. The intrusion of foreign wisdom 30

i. The intrusion of the Jews. 30

ii. The intrusion of the Zoroastrians. 31

iii. The influence of Christian thought. 34

5. The doctrine of the Divine authority of the rulers 35

i. The political aspect of the Shīʿī phenomenon. 35

ii. The development of the academic aspects of the Shīʿī Faith. 38

iii. The Orthodox explanation of the Qur'ān. 39

Page No.

Chapter II.

The Names of God and His Attributes. 40

1. The Names of God. 40

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī and the Sunnī traditionists. 41
ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī and the Shīʿī traditionists. 44

2. The relation between the Names and the One who is named. 45.

i. Al-Bukhārī's explanation of the sources of the Names of God. 45
ii. Al-Kulaynī's explanation of the sources of the Names of God. 51

3. The relationship of the Names of God with His Essence. 56

i. Al-Bukhārī's attitude to the question at issue. 56
ii. Al-Kulaynī's attitude to the question at issue. 60

4. The words Dhāt (Essence), Ṣifāt (Attributes) and Nuʿūt (Qualities) 62

i. The use of the word nafs. 62
ii. The use of the word Dhāt. 64
iii. The use of the word Ṣifāt. 65
iv. The use of the word Nuʿūt. 66

5. The explanation of the Nuʿūt (Qualities) of God. 67

i. Al-Bukhārī's explanation of the Nuʿūt of God. 67

(a) The Nuʿūt: The Face, The Eye, The Hand. 68
(b) The Establishment of God on His ʿArsh (Throne) 71

ii. Al-Kulaynī's explanation of the Nuʿūt of God. 73

(a) The Nuʿūt; the Face, the Eye, the Hand. 76
(b) The Establishment of God on His ʿArsh (Throne) 78

6. The various Attributes of God and their different categories. 80

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī on the point at issue. 82

(a) The difference between takwīn (Invention) and Irādah (Intention). 83
(b) The Kalām (Speech) of God. 85
(c) The Mashīʾah (good pleasure) and Irādah (Intention) of God. 89

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī on the point at issue. 93
(a) The Attribute of Takwīn (Invention). 93
(b) The Attribute of Kalām (Speech). 94
(c) The Attribute of Mashīʾah and Irādah. 96

7. The doctrine of the Vision of God in the Hereafter. 97

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī. 97
ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī. 101

Chapter III. Page No.

The Apostleship of God. 104

1. The question as to whether Apostleship is a benefit of God or whether there is an obligation on the part of God to send His Apostles. 104

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach on the point at issue. 106
ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach on the point at issue. 110

2. The question as to whether the necessity of people's recognition of God is based on reason or on His revelation to His Apostles. 113

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach. 113
ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach. 115

3. The question as to whether it is obligatory for all mankind to recognise and admit the Apostles of God. 117

i. Al-Bukharī's evidence. 118
Al-Kulaynī's evidence. 119

4. The nature of the Apostles. 120

i. The doctrine of al-Bukhārī and the Sunnīs. 121

(a) The Prophet's own doctrine. 121
(b) The doctrine of the Companions. 122
(c) The doctrine of the eminent Scholars. 123
(d) The physical expression of the spiritual excellence. 125

ii. The doctrine of al-Kulaynī and the Shīʿīs. 127

5. The various categories of the Apostles. 132

i. The origins of the words nabī and rasūl. 132
ii. The number of the Prophets and the Apostles. 135
iii. The various categories and their functions. 136
iv. The different modes of revelation. 139

6. The Apostleship is God's election and cannot be acquired by spiritual mortification. 141

i. Al-Bukharī's evidence. 141
ii. Al-Kulaynī's evidence. 143

7. The Quality of the Prophets whereby they are basically at one. 144

i. Al-Bukharī's approach on the point at issue. 145
ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach on the point at issue. 146

8. The Quality of the Prophets as being Maʿṣūm (sinless). 147

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach on the point at issue. 148
ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach on the point at issue. 150

9. The miracles of the Prophets. 153

i. The influence of the miracles. 155
ii. The various kinds of miracles. 156.

Page No.

(a) The sending down of food. 157
(b) The knowledge of the future and hidden affairs. 159
(c) The healing of the sick. 161

10. The particular qualities of the Prophethood of Muhammad 163

i. The International Prophethood. 163

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī. 165
(b) The approach of al-Kulaynī. 166

ii. The Seal of the Prophets after whom there is no Prophet to be born. 167

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī. 169
(b) The approach of al-Kulaynī. 172

Chapter IV.

The Imāmah in Islām. 176

1. The Succession to the Prophet. 176

i. The implied meaning of the Imāmah. 176
ii. Ulū al-ʿAmr, the men of authority. 177
iii. The word Khilāfah for the pious succession. 177

2. The question as to whether the Commandments are authoritative or the ulū al-ʿAmr themselves. 178

3. The question as to when the Religion attained perfection and completion. 179

4. The functions of the Imāms. 181

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī. 181
ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī. 184

(a) The administrative aspect of the Imāmah. 184
(b) The spiritual aspect of the Imāmah. 185

5. The establishment of the Imāmah among the Sunnīs. 187

i. The question as to whether the Prophet appointed his successor. 189
ii. The Muslims' affair being a matter of counsel. 192
iii. The prediction of the Prophet and his desire. 193
iv. The proposal and the appointment of Abū Bakr as Caliph. 196
v. The allegiance of ʿAlī to Abū Bakr. 197
vi. The Shīʿī evidence of ʿAlī's co-operation with the three Caliphs. 199

(a) Co-operation with Abū Bakr. 199
(b) Co-operation with ʿUmar. 200
(c) Co-operation with ʿUthmān. 202

vii. The principles of the appointment of an Imām and his dismissal. 203

(a) The different methods of the appointment. 203
(b) The different categories of the Imāms. 204
(c) The conditions for the dismissal of an Imām. 205

Page No.

6. The establishment of the Imāmah among the Shīʿīs. 207

i. Al-Kulaynī's conception of Imāmah. 207
ii. The Divine Imāmah of ʿAlī and his successors 208
iii. The spiritual status of the Imāms. 218
iv. The Sunnī reaction in confrontation with the Shīʿī doctrine of Divine Imāmah. 219

7. The Qualities of the Imāms. 219

i. The Sunnī outlook. 220

(a) Knowledge and power. 220
(b) The tribe of Quraysh. 221
(c) The full control of the affairs. 222

ii. The Shīʿī outlook. 223

(a) The mankind of the Imāms. 223
(b) The sinless status of the Imām. 224
(c) The power to control the state affairs. 225
(d) The recognition of the Imām. 226

8. A brief sketch of the established Imāmah. 227

i. The Sunnī outlook. 227
ii. The Shīʿī outlook. 229

Chapter V.

Al-Ākhirah, the life after death. 233

1. The doctrine of al-Ākhirah. 233

i. The Qurʾānic explanation. 233
ii. The approach of al-Bukharī. 233
iii. The approach of al-Kulaynī. 234

2. The Rajʿah, the life after death in this world. 235

i. The Qurʾānic Verses with comparative explanation of the two schools. 236

(a) Selection of the people for gathering. 236
(b) The beast of the earth. 237
(c) Coming back to the place of return. 240
(d) The nearer chastisement before the greater chastisement. 242

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī in regard to the Rajʿah. 242
iii. The approach of al-Bukharī on the point at issue. 245

3. The question as to whether it is incumbent upon God to raise the dead. 248

i. The Qurʾānic guidance on the point at issue. 250
ii. The approach of al-Bukharī on the point at issue. 250
iii. The approach of al-Kulaynī on the point at issue. 253

4. Al-Barzakh, the state between death and the resurrection. 254

i. The Qurʾānic evidence of al-Barzakh. 254
ii. The approach of al-Bukhārī. 255

(a) The questioning in the grave. 255
(b) The chastisement in the grave for sinful believers. 256

iii. The approach of al-Kulaynī. 258

5. The relation between the soul and body in al-Barzakh. 262

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī. 265
ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī. 266

6. The abode of the soul in al-Barzakh. 268

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī. 270
ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī. 272

7. The augmentation of the deceased's good deeds in al-Barzakh. 277

i. The Sunnī evidence. 277
ii. The Shīʿī evidence. 278

8. The Resurrection. 279

i. The mode of resurrection. 279
ii. The time of the Hour of resurrection. 284
iii. The place of the resurrection. 285

9. The taking away of one's good or bad deeds in the hereafter. 286

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach in support of Retaliation in the hereafter. 287
ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach in regard to the doctrine of Ṭīnah (clay or dust). 288

10. Paradise and hell. 290

i. The question as to whether Paradise and hell are created or whether they will be created. 290

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī. 290
(b) The approach of al-Kulaynī. 292

ii. The ultimate allocation of Paradise and hell. 293

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī. 295
(b) The approach of al-Kulaynī. 296

iii. The joys of Paradise and the punishment of hell. 300

(a) The eternity of Paradise and hell. 300

(i) The Qurʾānic dictum. 301
(ii) The evidence of Sunnī tradition. 302
(iii) The evidence of Shīʿī tradition. 303

(b) The nature of the joys of Paradise. 303

(i) The approach of al-Bukhārī. 304
(ii) The approach of al-Kulaynī. 305

Bibliography. 307.

INTRODUCTION

The Scope and Focus of the Study.

This thesis provides a comparative study of the two major schools of Islām, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs, in respect of their fundamental doctrines drawn respectively from Muḥammad b. Ismaʿīl al-Bukhārī (256 A.H.), the chief Sunnī traditionist and Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī (328 A.H.), the chief Shīʿī traditionist.

Al-Bukhārī was the disciple of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.), the founder of the Ḥanbalī 'school of thought' in jurisprudence as well as in dogmatics. His voluminous work *Al-Jāmiʿ al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musnad* (generally known as *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ*) has been accepted as the most accurate and correct compilation of the *ḥadīth*. Al-Kulaynī occupies approximately the same position among the Shīʿīs and is distinct from the other Shīʿī traditionists in that he compiled his voluminous work *Al-Kāfī* during the Minor Occultation of the Divine Imām al-Mahdī (born in 256 A.H.); and the Imām approved it and named it *Kāfī* as being sufficient for the Shīʿīs. So the comparative study of these two canonical Books mirrors the whole position of the two major schools of Islām and of Islām as well.

The *ḥadīth* has been recorded along two different lines, that of the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs. The conditions of transmission, the trustworthiness of the transmitters and the authenticity of the chains in the two lines of traditionists have always been different. The text of these two Books is the focus of the study, and the emphasis is therefore on the basic doctrines of Islām and not on the chains and the reliability of transmission, with some exceptions, where helpful.

The Scholars of Islāmic Studies, from East and West, have discussed the doctrines of these two divergent lines separately but they have not been comparatively studied in terms of how they trace back their opinions to their respective authorities.

It is also a fact that the focal point of the attention of the traditionists was Law and Jurisprudence and they did not favour the logical presentation of Islāmic dogma. The later scholastic theologians, as given in 'the background of the problem', discussed the doctrinal position of Islām in logical terms and it is noteworthy that the dogma of Islām has been introduced to the academic world in the West mostly

through the works of scholastic theologians like Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (324 A.H.), Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī (333 A.H.), Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (505 A.H.), Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (537 A.H.), Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) and their Western interpreters; and very little attention has been paid as to how these doctrines have their origins in the corpus of the ḥadīth.

In recent times there has been a revival of interest in the early works of Islām especially in the West. Research has been encouraged to show how the later works on various branches of knowledge have their origin firmly set in the early corpus of the ḥadīth and how the guide lines of early sources were observed in the later explanations. We appreciate E.E. Elder's valuable attempt to provide authentic references of the ḥadīth to the traditions given in the text of al-Taftāzānī and to the subject matter therein. Nevertheless these depict the scholastic aspect of the traditions rather than the traditional colour of the dogmatics.

In the East too, no such attempt has been made in recent times for a critical study of the origins of the creed of Islām in accordance with the early collections. To the best of our knowledge no approach along the scholastic lines has so far been provided for any of the early canonical works of the ḥadīth.

The comparative study of the works of these two eminent traditionists regarding the fundamental doctrines of Islām and their explanation with reference to the later works of scholastic theology illustrates the distinct attitudes of the two distinct circles, of the traditionists and the dialecticians, in the two major Schools of Islām.

We admit that this is a very extensive subject under which every issue of Islāmic studies could be discussed. We have had to be content to discuss here the three most important issues for the Sunnīs, the Names and Attributes of God, the Apostleship, and the Hereafter; and the four most important issues of the Shīʿīs, the Names of God, the Apostleship, the Imāmah and the Hereafter. This may have provided a basis for exploring further details which unite and separate these two major groups of Islām.

The background of the problem.

Islām in its preliminary stage was a simple religion and there was little necessity for the logical presentation of Islamic Dogma. The Prophet laid stress on the Oneness of God, the life after death and the ethical virtues of life; and with the exception of having faith in God's decree he discouraged his followers from entering into speculation about God. He directed mankind to think about what was created rather than about the Creator.

At the end of the first century of Islām political dissensions among the Muslims had arisen in the context of dogmatic discussions. With the development of parallel streams of thought some scholars of Islām began to think of Islāmic dogma in parallel logical terms and in some circles these discussions emerged as doctrinal innovations.

The second century commenced with the full spate of doctrinal disputes but the orthodox Muslims mostly kept apart from these dissensions. The introduction of dialectics into Islām was generally considered as an innovation and these streams were denounced by the party of the Tradition, the traditionists, and those who agreed with them. The ḥadīth literature, which records the Sunnah of the Prophet and how the Companions exercised their Religion, is an all-embracing corpus which deals with every aspect of the Prophet's instructions and which describes how the Companions acted upon that. The party of the Tradition considered the days of the Companions of the Prophet and their Successors as the golden age of Islām when there was no notable use of dialectics. The traditionists opposed the dialecticians and they did not like to discuss the doctrinal position of Islām in logical terms. This attitude of the traditionists is more explicitly observed in the seats of learning in the Ḥijāz and Syria. Irāq was virtually the centre of all the dogmatic discussions. It was at Baṣrah that the emphasis on reason first appeared and among its grammarians were to be found many men of learning who readily permitted reason to throw back the single reports of the party of the Tradition. Kūfah was the centre of Shīʿī learning and tradition and it was here too that the parallel orthodox seat of Abū Ḥanīfah was required to face all the doctrinal disputes of the time.

Abū Ḥanīfah, the Imām (150 A.H.), is stated as being the First Orthodox Imām to compose a systematic work of Islāmic Dogma, namely Fiqh al-Akbar and then Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.), al-Bukhārī (256 A.H.), Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭaḥāwī (321 A.H.), Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī (458 A.H.) worked to preserve the Orthodox Faith. Important contributions of the traditionists in this context include the specific Book-Chapter of Al-Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī in which he refutes the doctrines of al-Jahmīyah and the particular work of his, known as Kitāb Khalq Afʿāl al-ʿIbād (in which al-Bukhārī refutes the doctrine of the Muʿtazilīs and proves that the actions of the servants are created by God), the Kitāb al-Tawḥīd of Abū Bakr b. Abū Khuzaymah (311 A.H.) and the Kitāb al-Asmāʾ wa al-Ṣifāt of al-Bayhaqī.

Meanwhile Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (324 A.H.), Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī (333 A.H.), Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī (403 A.H.), Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī al-Tamīmī (427 A.H.) and Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Saʿīd Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī (after 460 A.H.) more systematically and logically safeguarded the doctrinal position of Orthodox Islām and laid the foundation stone of scholastic theology. They did not oppose the traditionists but their method of presentation was somewhat different and at times they interpreted things about the modes (Kayf) of which the traditionists did not allow any interpretation. However, those who advanced assertions, expressed in a logical or dialectic fashion, were named mutakallimūn, the scholastic theologians, whereas the traditionists were called Muḥaddithūn. The late scholars like Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (537 A.H.), al-Bayḍāwī (685 A.H.), Abū al-Thānā al-Isfahānī (749 A.H.), al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) and al-Jurjānī (816 A.H.) mostly give opinions and interpretations on the scholastic lines.

Apart from these two Orthodox lines, the traditionists and the Scholastic theologians, there were also the Shīʿīs who believed in Twelve Imāms; they too strove to preserve the doctrinal position of their faith. They were not overanxious about this because of their Divine faith in a Living Divine Imām to whom they could easily refer their dissensions. They fully availed themselves of this situation until the Major Occultation of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Mahdī.

Al-Kulaynī discusses dogmatics in Al-Kāfī but in principle he keeps himself consistent with the line of traditionists and Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Ḥakīm al-Ṭūsī (672 A.H.) and Ibn Muṭahhar

al-Ḥillī are generally considered the interpreters of Shīʿī dialectics.

The Analysis and its application.

In order to explain the approach of al-Bukhārī and to provide an authentic Sunnī outlook, we have illustrated our subject with the explanation of other Sunnī traditionists whose works are generally regarded as being second in authority to Al-Ṣaḥiḥ of al-Bukhārī; we have frequently referred to Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.), al-Dārimī (255 A.H.), Muslim (261 A.H.), Abū Dāʾūd (275 A.H.), al-Tirmidhī (279 A.H.), Ibn Mājah (273 A.H.) and to some of their co-Religionists. For the explanation of the approach of al-Kulaynī (328 A.H.), we have referred to al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq al-Qummī (381 A.H.), al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (404 A.H.), al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (436 A.H.), Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifah Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (460 A.H.) and to some other eminent Shīʿī scholars. We are in general indebted to Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (852 A.H.), the Chief Commentator of Al-Ṣaḥiḥ of al-Bukhārī, and Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī (1110 A.H.), the Chief Commentator of Al-Kāfī of al-Kulaynī.

The two divergent Sunnī and Shīʿī strands in the early books of the ḥadīth reflect differing beliefs, differing ways of exercising Religion and differing forms of legal opinions; but in spite of being distinct they are close to each other due to their basic agreement on the central guidance of the Qurʾān. Accordingly we have discussed our subject with reference to the relevant verses of the Qurʾān. As to the exegesis of the Qurʾān we have not overlooked the doctrinal position of this in these two major schools.

The Method.

The Qurʾānic references have been quoted in accordance with the Delhi edition. In order to maintain a balance between the two major schools of Islām the translation is mostly the writer's own. In the translation of other quotations an attempt has been made to convey the sense rather than to give a literal meaning.

The year by which the Companions and the other theologians have been introduced generally denotes the year of death. As regards titles the most well-known have been abbreviated.

In transliteration an attempt has been made to follow the practice of Western scholars of the ḥadīth such as Professor James Robson, with few exceptions.

FOREWORD

The authority of the Prophet in Islām and the authenticity of the hadīth.

It is desired to give here a foreword to the issue of the authority of the Prophet in Islām. The Sunnah of the Prophet is considered as fundamental to the interpretation of the Qur'ān, and hadīth literature is thus used as the basis of religious thought in this whole area. It is also appropriate to give a brief sketch of the reliability and authenticity of the hadīth collections of the two major Schools of Islām, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs; these collections are completely independent and have been compiled on different lines. They record the Sunnah of the Prophet and are among our main sources of information about early Islām. A comprehensive study of these two lines depicts the whole doctrinal as well as the practical position of Islām. We have discussed these issues in detail in a separate thesis[1], entitled 'Early Concepts of the Authority and Authenticity of the Sunnī And Shīʿī Transmission in Theory and Practice'. In principle the Qur'ān unites these two divergent lines of Islām and the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs also unanimously recognise the authority of the Prophet. Besides this basic agreement both the Schools claim that they have correctly preserved the Sunnah of the Prophet in their respective corpus of hadīth.

In confirming these points this foreword will give references rather than actual quotations which have fully been given and discussed in that thesis. That thesis constitutes a foundation for the present thesis in terms of careful argument that the corpus of hadīth literature needs to be taken more seriously, not least by Western Scholarship, as a well-authenticated source for early legal and also dogmatic thinking in Islām. The relevance of the hadīth to jurisprudence is generally accepted but

[1] This thesis is catalogued in the Birmingham University Library as dissertation A3B69, the book No. 733623.

both theses show that jurisprudence cannot be kept in a compartment separate from doctrine. Dogmatic speculation was germinating very early in Islāmic history even if it was only in later centuries that some of the more subtle and controversial issues were followed through.

This foreword helps to explain, objectively in terms of criteria of authenticity, and subjectively in terms of charismatic authority, why the ḥadīth is an appropriate locus in which to look for fundamental doctrinal formulations.

1. The Authority of the Prophet

The Qur'ān requires of its believers a faithful submission to God and an unconditional obedience to His Prophet[1]. On this issue, every verdict of the Qur'ān is regarded as perfect and absolute and no condition has ever been laid down relating to any limitation of the jurisdiction of obedience to the Prophet. On the other hand obedience to the ulū al-Amr, the possessors of authority, is stated as being conditional upon the fact that they should not contravene the Command of God and the Sunnah of the Prophet. In the case of any conflict the Qur'ān allows[2] the believers to differ with the possessors of authority and to refer the case to the Qur'ān and the Prophet. In light of this Qur'ānic guidance it is difficult to be reconciled to Goldziher's thesis that the Islāmic concept of the Sunnah is largely a revised statement of ancient Arab views on custom[3]. Such a thesis would only be plausible if it were to be taken to mean that the practice of the community was based on the considered opinion of their jurists, and based also on the presumption that the scholars and the theorists of Islām, by their practice and living tradition, were correctly approaching the Sunnah of the Prophet. Schacht is more explicit than Goldziher on this issue, showing

[1]See, S4:80, S8:1, S8:20, S24:63, S47:33, S 58:13.

[2]See, S4:59.

[3]See, Goldziher, Muslim Studies, V.2. p.26. The Qur'ān clearly rejects the idea of following the forefathers if their practice is not based on reason and they are not on the right path (See, S2:170).

that the early Muslim's idea of living tradition was the uninterrupted practice of their community, beginning with the Prophet, maintained by the first caliphs and the later rulers, and verified by the scholars[1]. Goldziher accepts that it is generally admitted that the Sunnah as the normative principle in the Muslim life is as old as Islām[2]; and the Sunnah meant all that could be shown to have been the practices of the Prophet and his earliest followers[3]. It indicates that the surpassing authority of the Prophet, that is clearly asserted in this verse, has never been a point of dispute in the early days of Islām.

This verse further explains that the Prophet had more authoritative value than that of a head of state. Obedience to the Prophet is an integral part of faith[4] whereas obedience to a head of state is only a matter of law and administration. A 'head of state' demands obedience from the public, at times by force, whereas the Prophet comes to guide and teach, and not to force or compel.[5]

The Qur'ān establishes the Prophet as Arbiter[6] in all disputes and requires the believers not to have any resistance in their souls against his decision. The Sunnīs and the Shī'īs frequently refer[7] to this verse in this respect in their respective ḥadīth literature. This further explains that the authority of the Prophet is more than that of a mere arbiter as rejection of an arbiter's decision does not amount to kufr

[1]See, Schacht, An Introduction to Islāmic Law, p.33.

[2]See, Goldziher, op.cit., v.2. p.31.

[3]See, ibid., v.2. p.26.

[4]See, S3:31, S4:65, S8:1, S33:36.

[5]See, S24:54, 64:12, 88:22.

[6]See, S4:65.

[7]See, for Sunnī evidence, al-Shāfi'ī, Kitāb al-Umm, v.7. p.251, Ikhtilāf al-ḥadīth, p.39 and for Shī'ī evidence, al-Kulayni, Al-Kāfi, v.1. p.390.

(disbelief). Moreover the Qur'ān speaks of the Prophet as being a good pattern[1] in all walks of life; and in recognition of the authority of the Prophet there is frequent reference[2] to this verse also, in ḥadīth literature of both the Schools. They further hold that the Qur'ānic verdict 'what the Prophet gives you take'[3] is an all-embracing dictum which covers[4] all the traditions, provided that they are correctly traced back to the Prophet.

It would be appropriate to mention here that according to the Muslim Faith the Prophet had been endowed with certain special privileges (Al-Khaṣā'iṣ)which were not taken as a precedent for others and there is Qur'ānic evidence[5] in favour of this. In light of this category of the deeds of the Prophet the remarks of the eminent successors like Makḥūl (112 A.H.) and al-Zuhrī (124 A.H.), on two different occasions, as quoted by Goldziher hardly question the authority of the Prophet; but they allude to that category of Al-Khaṣā'iṣ. The Muslim conception of the special privileges of the Prophet has its origin firmly rooted in the Qur'ān and it is not an after-thought attempt 'to curb and discipline the mania for Sunnah'.[6]

A further development of the Prophet's authority comes with the aspect of his role as interpreter[7]; and this is also a common outlook

[1]See, S33:21.

[2]See, al-Bukhārī, Al-Sahīh, v.2.p.189, 192, v.7. p.178, v.8. p.178, for the Sunnī evidence and see, al-Sharīf al-Radī, Nahj al-Balāghah, v.2. p.276, for the Shī'ī evidence.

[3]See, S59:7.

[4]See, al-Shāfi'ī, Kitāb al-Umm, v.7. p.251, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.7. p.213, al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī, Al-Kifāyah, p.12, al-Shāṭibī, Al-Muwāfaqāt, v.4.p.25, Shāh Walī Allāh, Hujjat Allāh, v.1. p.127, for the Sunnī evidence and al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1. p.64, v1. p.265, v2. p.182, v.6. p.281, for the Shī'ī evidence.

[5]See, S33:50, 17:79.

[6]See, Goldziher, op.cit., p.31.

[7]See, S16:44, 2:129, 3:163.

of the Sunnīs[1] and the Shīʿīs[2]. It is agreed that it is the Prophet who formulated the practical code of Islām whereas in most places the Qur'ān is general and brief. Had it not been explained by the Prophet, no one could have said precisely how the Qur'ān's general instructions should be applied. This state of affairs explains how the Sunnah of the Prophet as the normative principle in Muslim's life is as old as Islām.

The Divine origin of traditional laws is another aspect of the Muslim's Faith. There is Qur'ānic evidence that it was not only in the receipt of the Qur'ān that the Prophet was endowed with Divine guidance. The Qur'ān refers[3] to a revelation which was vouchsafed to the Prophet but the original revelation to which reference is here made does not appear in the Qur'ān. There is another reference[4] in the Qur'ān that the Companions cut down some of the palm-trees of their enemy (to induce them to open their forts) under the Command of God but the original command does not appear in the Qur'ān. Such passages of the Qur'ān suggest that there were some revelations other than those in the Qur'ān[5].

[1]See, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, op.cit., p.15.
[2]See, al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.l. p.287.
[3]See, S66:3. [4]See, S59:5.
[5]In light of this evidence we are not convinced by Goldziher's observation that the Divine origin of traditional laws and practices was not taken for granted in olden times. (Goldziher, op.cit., v.2. pp.31-2). Goldziher argues this on the basis of ʿUmar's comment to ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr, the eminent scholar and Successor (born 22 A.H.), 'Think what you say': when the latter told him that Jibrīl had told the Prophet the times for prayer. ʿUrwah had referred to a tradition of the Prophet without quoting any source for his information. This was really the point that caused ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz to make that comment. This view finds support in the fact that ʿUrwah then transmitted to ʿUmar on the authority of Bashīr b. Abī Masʿūd, he from his father Abū Masʿūd al-Anṣārī, the Companion (died after 40 A.H.), that he had received that information regarding the times for prayer. ʿUmar then made no objection to this report. ʿUmar had not missed the time-limit of ʿAsr prayer but, on account of his sermon, had missed only the first-time of that prayer; and the word shayaʾ bears testimony to it. It is also noteworthy that ʿUrwah told ʿUmar the story of Jibrīl's leading the prayer after that comment of ʿUmar; this is not as stated by Goldziher that ʿUmar had made that comment after the story regarding the prayer-times had been told to him. However there is no idea in this report that ʿUmar rejected the Divine origin of traditional orders. It should also be noted that there is some difference about the correct version of that comment of ʿUmar's. In some manuscripts it is aʿlamu mā taqūlu (I know what you say) whereas in some it is iʿlam mā taqūlu (think what you say).

The Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs have a common outlook that the Prophet lived under the Divine cover of God. They have evolved careful definitions concerning the Prophetic jurisdiction in which he spoke always under Divine guidance. The Prophetic use of qiyās (analogy) is also divinely protected and an opinion formed on the basis of such analogy is also binding upon the community, unless there is an explicit check upon this. According to the Muslim Faith all the commands and actions of the Prophet, whether based on Divine revelation[1] or on protected analogy, carry Divine value.

It is true that the Prophet's position as Law-giver is somewhat different from his position as mere man. What he said concerning worldly affairs which have no connection with religion is not binding upon anyone[2]; but there is complete agreement of both the Schools that the Prophet in his position as Law-giver had Divine inspiration in all his instructions as well as in his actions irrespective of their being mentioned in the Qurʾān. In some sayings of the Prophet there is clear mention of God's revelation[3] and in some of them there is reference to the descent of Jibrīl[4],

[1] 'Divine revelation' covers here the Qurʾānic revelation and revelation other than the Qurʾān to which explicit reference is made whether in the Qurʾān or in the traditions.

[2] The Prophet has been reported as saying: I am a man; when I suggest anything regarding religion, take it; and when I say anything of my own opinion, then I am an human being. (See, Shāh Walī Allāh, op.cit., v.1. p.127. The Shīʿīs corroborate this opinion of the Sunnīs. (See, al-Māmaqānī, op.cit., v.3., Appendix, p.79, Line 21).

[3] See, for the Sunnī evidence, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1. p.32, v.2. p.47, v.9. p.116, Muslim, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, v.1. p.83, v.5. p.80, al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, Mishkāt, p.36; and for the Shīʿī evidence: al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2. p.440, v.7. p.442.

[4] See for the Sunnī evidence, Mālik, Muwattāʾ, v.1. p.244, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1. p.139, v.4. p.25, Muslim, op.cit., v.3. p.64, v.5. p.161, al-Tirmidhī, Al-Sunan, v.2. p.174, al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.71; and for the Shīʿī evidence: al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1. p.449, v.2. p.74, 98, v.3. p.208, 233, v.4. p.40, 51, 246, v.5. p.3, 9, 80, v.6. p.34, 53, 376, 495, 526, v.8. p.49, 185, 202, 233, 262, 336, 340, al-Ṣuddūq, Maʿānī al-Akhbār, p.179. For such "frequent reference in ḥadīth literature of both the Schools we stress that the doctrine of the Divine origin of traditional laws had not developed late after the second century of Islām, as held by Goldziher, but it appears firmly-rooted in the Qurʾān also. We have already discussed this issue in footnote 5 on page v.

although the issues discussed therein are not found in the Qur'ān. This state of affairs confirms the idea of the Divine origin of the traditional laws.

In Muslim Jurisprudence, the Sunnah occupies a second position[1] as balanced with the Qur'ān but it is agreed that both of them are under the cover of God. Both are considered as of equal importance. The difference between these two kinds of revelation is the difference between 'letter' and 'message' and both are legally binding upon the believers. The continuing authoritative value of the commands and actions of the Prophet was not a point of dispute in the early centuries of Islām and it is the Sunnah which has always been serving as the purported meaning of the Qur'ān. This Sunnah is always mentioned as being the second source of information regarding Islām.

In the times of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah we observe that the Prophetic guidance carried continuous authoritative value. On the death of the Prophet the issue arose as to where the Prophet's body should be buried[2]. Similarly the questions arose whether the wives of the Prophet should have their share in his bequests[3], whether a grandmother had her share from the bequest of her grandson[4], and whether it was permissible for Abū Bakr to fight with those who had rejected[5] to pay zakāh (poor-tax). In all such incidents Abū Bakr acted upon the instructions of the Prophet. ʿUmar held the opinion that there was no share for a woman in the blood-wit paid for her husband but when Abū Ḍaḥḥāk b. Sufyān told him a decision of the Prophet in such a case, ʿUmar revised his judgement and took his decision[6] in accordance with the

[1]Obedience to the Prophet is stated in the Qur'ān as being next to obedience to God. See, S58:13, S24:63, S47:33. The Prophet himself stated his Sunnah as being next to the Book of God. (See, Mālik, op.cit., v.2. p.208, al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2. p.85, 606.

[2]Ibn Mājah, Al-Sunan, v.1. p.255, al-Tirmidhī, Shamā'il, p.28.

[3]See, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8. p.187.

[4]See, al-Tirmidhī, Al-Sunan, v.2. p.31. [5]See, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.2. p.131.

[6]See, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2. p.32, al-Shāfiʿī, Risālah, p.59.

tradition of the Prophet. A case of abortion, effected during a fight, was once brought to ʿUmar and he asked for a tradition of the Prophet concerning that case. On having been told that there was a relevant tradition of the Prophet he took his decision accordingly[1]. ʿUmar hesitated to impose the <u>jizyah</u> (poll-tax) upon the fire-worshippers but when he was informed that the Prophet had imposed the poll-tax upon the Magi of Hijr he took a positive decision[2]. This attitude of ʿUmar towards the Sunnah was not confined to court affairs but he issued general orders to the governors of the cities to educate the people in their religion and teach them the Sunnah of the Prophet[3].

In the time of ʿUthmān a question arose whether a widow could stay for her prescribed period (four months and ten days[4]) with her people if her husband had not left her in a house of his own. ʿUthmān sent to Zaynab bint Kaʿb b. ʿUjrah who told him a decision of the Prophet in such a case and ʿUthmān gave judgement[5] accordingly. ʿAlī, the fourth Caliph, advised his people not to hoard goods[6] for the rise of the prices and not to torture an assassin[7] (before executing him) because the Prophet had given instructions not to do so. This authoritative value of the instructions of the Prophet can be seen more explicitly in the lines which ʿAlī gave to his tax-collectors[8]. Muʿāwiyah also stressed the authenticity of the traditions as having come down from the Prophet and

[1] <u>Ibid</u>., p.59.

[2] See, al-Bukhārī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.4. p.117.

[3] See, Abū Yūsuf al-Qāḍī, <u>Kitāb al-Kharāj</u>, p.16.

[4] See, <u>S</u>2:234.

[5] See, al-Tirmidhī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1. p.144, al-Shāfiʿī, <u>op.cit</u>., p.60.

[6] See, al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.4. p.525.

[7] See, <u>ibid</u>., v.4. p.506.

[8] See, al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit.</u>, v.3. p.537.

rejected any tradition[1] which was not correctly traced back to the Prophet.

Such incidents collectively demonstrate that the traditions of the Prophet were continuously accepted as part of the basis of Islāmic Law and that they had obtained a legal status in the very early days of Islām.

We find the evidence of the first[2] and the second[3] centuries of Islām in further support. Learning the traditions, zeal for their collection, transmission from memory and criticism of the chains and transmitters were in full swing in those times. The early theorists like Abū Ḥanīfah (150 A.H.)[4], al-Awzāʿī (157 A.H.)[5], Mālik (179 A.H.)[6], al-Shāfiʿī (204 A.H.)[7] and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.)[8] all agree with this in principle and there is ample evidence of the Shīʿī Imāms[9] also in its favour.

It is true that in matters of Law and Jurisprudence the inhabitants of newly Islāmised areas were not properly educated in their religion; and in the early days of Islām the instructions of the Prophet were not scrupulously enough transmitted there. At that time uncertainty prevailed there regarding the issues for which no provision was made in the Qurʾān. These new generations could learn the Qurʾān but they had very little knowledge about the Sunnah of the Prophet; and the little that was available had to be elaborated speculatively by all the methodical means of legal deduction. In this state of uncertainty the jurists applied analogy

[1]See, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4. p.218.

[2]See, ibid., v.1. p.36, al-Dārimī, Al-Sunan, v.1. p.114, al-Dhahabī, Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ, v.1. p.91, 103, 145, 170.

[3]See, ibid., v.1. p.243, 283. Almost all the prominent critical traditionists belong to this century.

[4]See, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Kitāb al-Intiqā , p.144, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Tārīkh Baghdād, v.13. p.368, al-Dhahabī, Manāqib, p.20.

[5]See, al-Dhahabī, Tadhkirah, v.1. p.170.

[6]See, Ibn Qaiyam, Iʿlām, v.1. p.90, al-Zaylaʿī, Naṣb al-Rāyah, v.4. p.64.

[7]See, al-Shāfiʿī, op.cit., p.7.

[8]See, Ibn Kathīr, Al-Bidāyah, v.10, p.334.

[9]See, al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1. p.70, v.3. p.240, v.4. p.291, 331, 403, 432, v.5. p.455. p.453, v.6. p.31, 58.

to fill in all the gaps in this whole area. This was not really in opposition to the instructions of the Prophet nor a view-point to question the authority of the Prophet; it was only an interim step to fill in the gaps. We agree with Goldziher that this uncertainty occurred mostly in the generations of the Successors[1]. If they had been ignorant of some of the instructions of the Prophet they were occasionally unsure even of Qur'ānic Law. This explanation holds that if there had been any neglect of the Prophetic guidance in those days it was on account of ignorance and there was no idea of any sort of rejection to the authority of the Prophet. The authority of the Prophet had already been recognised long before the authority of documentary material consisting of the instructions of the Prophet was recognised. This view-point finds further support in Goldziher's observation that as long as the science of tradition was developed ḥadīth in the schools working on analogy occupied the same position as in the opposing school working on the tradition[2]. This suggests that basically the authority of the Prophet had never been disputed; nor was it in any way equated with the opinions of the later authorities.

It is highly debatable that the generations before al-Shāfi'ī valued the traditions from the Prophet on the same level as they accepted traditions from the Companions and the Successors and that it was only al-Shāfi'ī who laid down the superiority of the Prophetic guidance in

[1]See, Goldziher, op.cit., v.2. p.78.

[2]See, ibid., v.2. p.82.

principle[1]. There are instances in the works of al-Awzāʿī (157 A.H.), the Imām of the Syrian School, Mālik (179 A.H.), the Imām of the Medinan School and Abū Yūsuf (182 A.H.), one of the Imāms of the Iraqian School

[1]For reasons already given in this context we are not convinced by Schacht's expression that it was al-Shāfiʿī who first stressed the superiority of the Prophetic guidance. (See Schacht, Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, p.3) At times, no doubt, al-Shāfiʿī speaks as if he only stressed the superiority of the Prophetic guidance after it had completely been neglected; but a careful examination of the various statements of al-Shāfiʿī indicates that certain of such statements of al-Shāfiʿī were only his clever debating expressions. This idea finds support in Schacht's own statement that al-Shāfiʿī, in his later days revised his previous attitudes towards his predecessors. (See, ibid, p.10). Schacht further explains that the ancient schools of law shared the old concept of the Sunnah or 'living tradition' as the ideal practice of the community but he admits that the Iraqians had been the first to claim for it the authority of the Prophet by calling it the Sunnah of the Prophet. (See, ibid., p.80). This state of affairs shows that al-Shāfiʿī and his predecessors were not really at variation and they all accepted the superiority of the Prophetic guidance in principle, although they differed in their application of the traditions. Schacht further admits that: 'Abū Yūsuf is bound by traditions more than Awzāʿī though less than al-Shāfiʿī but that he combines this with competent systematic reasoning'. (See, ibid., p.302). Goldziher states that it was said of Abū Yūsuf that he was Ṣāhib ḥadīth wa ṣāhib Sunnah. (See, Goldziher, op.cit., p.25). Goldziher further states: 'Abū Yūsuf has recourse to traditions against teachings based on analogy which departed from them, and he contradicts his teacher Abū Ḥanīfa by appealing to traditions. Al-Shaybānī, the other great pupil of Abū Ḥanīfa seeks traditional foundations for the teachings of Fiqh in Medina at the feet of Mālik': (Ibid., p.80). We differ from Goldziher that Abū Yūsuf and al-Shaybānī really contradicted their teacher in principle. Instead, we see that Abū Ḥanīfah himself held the same doctrine that the Prophetic guidance can never be superseded by the later authorities. (See, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Kitāb al-Intiqa, p.144). Abū Ḥanīfah was a teacher of a school which had originally been started by the oldest teacher of Islām, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd the Companion (See, Goldziher, op.cit., p.35), who also held the same doctrine as that of which al-Shāfiʿī is said to have been a systematic founder. (See, al-Nasāʾī, Al-Sunan, v.2. p.305). This continuous evidence explains that Abū Yūsuf's and al-Shaybānī's appealing to traditions was merely an advanced study of the subject concerned and not a contradiction to their teacher in principle. However it is evident from Goldziher's quoted comment that it was not al-Shāfiʿī who first stressed the superiority of the Prophetic guidance. Schacht himself states that: 'the main thesis of the traditionists, as opposed to the ancient schools of law, was that formal traditions deriving from the Prophet superseded the living tradition of the school. It was not enough for the ancient schools to claim that their doctrines as a whole were based on the teachings of the Companions of the Prophet who presumably knew the intention of their master best or even that their living tradition represented the Sunna of the Prophet': (Schacht, An Introduction to Islāmic Law, p.34). In light of this the Muslims assert that the authority of the Prophet has never been a point of dispute in the early times.

which clearly hold that the traditions of the Prophet were never allowed to be superseded by the later authorities[1]. Al-Shāfi'ī himself admits that he has not heard anyone who was considered as having knowledge or claimed to have knowledge opposing that thesis[2].

We admit that there are some differences between al-Shāfi'ī and his predecessors in this area of discussion and these are really the basis for the criticism of Goldziher, Schacht and others in respect of the traditions. But if we are to give a plausible interpretation to these differences we may conclude that the real difference between al-Shāfi'ī and his predecessors is in their approach to the established command of the Prophet and not in their recognition of the prior authority of the Prophet. Al-Shāfi'ī stresses the correctness of the chain and the reliability of the transmitters for the authenticity of a tradition whereas his predecessors, in their approach to the established command of the Prophet, valued the living tradition of the Companions more than their mere dependence upon the chain of the trustworthy transmitters. It was with such a method that they approached to the Sunnah of the Prophet; otherwise they all held the same opinion that the Prophetic guidance cannot be superseded by the later authorities. As regards the paramount authority of the Prophet there is no difference of opinion among them. The early Shī'ī scholars of ḥadīth also agreed with the predecessors of al-Shafī'ī and approached the Sunnah of the Prophet through the practice of their Imāms whom they regarded as having been divinely protected from sins and slips.

[1]See for Mālik's view-point, Mālik, op. cit., v.1. p.213, 214, v.2. p.208; for Abū Yūsuf's view-point Abū Yūsuf, op.cit., p.90; for al-Awzā'ī's view-point, al-Dhahabī, op.cit., v.1. p.170. Al-Awzā'ī further transmits from 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz that no one is allowed to give his opinion against the Sunnah of the Prophet. See. al-Dārimī, op.cit., v.1. p.114.

[2]See, al-Shāfi'ī, Kitāb al-Umm, v.7. p.250.

They did not stress the authenticity of the chains because they considered that rectification by the living Imāms could easily cover all the defects in transmission. It is right that the Shīʿī scholars of ḥadīth looked towards chains in their approach to the Imāms but they did not require any chain of transmitters from the Imāms to the Prophet. However the prior legal authority of the Prophet was not under any shadow of suspicion either among al-Shāfiʿī and his Sunnī predecessors or among the early Shīʿī scholars of ḥadīth; they all unanimously recognised the prior authority of the Prophet.

We further admit that there are issues which apparently call into question the early authority and authenticity of the traditions. Did the Prophet command that nothing be written except the Qur'ān? Did the Prophet regard the Qur'ān as sufficient guidance after him? Are the Book and the Family of the Prophet sufficient guides after the Prophet? What is force of the statement of ʿUmar that 'the Book of God is sufficient for us'? These questions generally arise against the early authority of the traditions. The Muslims' outlook towards these questions is to interpret such statements without implying any rejection of the authority of the Prophet and his traditions. The Prophet's command that nothing be written except the Qur'ān[1] was mostly confined to the period when the Qur'ān was being recorded and it was considered necessary not to record anything else in those times; and because the Qur'ān covers all the Prophetic guidance in principle it was at times stated as a sufficient guide for the Muslims[2] and there was no idea of any sort of rejection to the authority of the Prophet therein. In the statement that 'the Qur'ān and the Family of the Prophet are sufficient guides'[3] the Family of the Prophet does not replace the Sunnah of the Prophet but it suggests

[1] See, Muslim, op.cit., v.8. p.229.

[2] See, Ibid., v.4. p.41, Ibn Mājah, op.cit., v.2. p.133, Ibn Kathīr, op.cit., v.5. p.170.

[3] Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Al-Musnad, v.3. p.14, 17, 26, 95, v.5. p.182, 189.

that the Prophetic guidance is only with the Family of the Prophet, after him. Similarly the statement[1] of ʿUmar given above was not general but related to that state of agony in which the Prophet was at that time; and this statement of ʿUmar related to a time when the perfection of the religion had already been declared.

Such interpretations harmonise apparently conflicting reports with the basic idea that obedience to the Prophet is as obligatory for the Muslims as their obedience to the Word of God and that this obedience had never been a point of dispute in Muslim Law and jurisprudence. It further explains that the authority of the Prophet is never to be superseded by later authorities. The later authorities are subject to analogical discussion but the Commands of the Prophet and his Sunnah are themselves authoritative; Al-Shāfiʿī, furthermore, revised his expression in his later days whereas in his earlier days he had been treating the Iraqians with scorn and alleging that they had been overlooking the Prophetic guidance. It is true that the earlier expression of Al-Shāfiʿī was only a clever debating point, for none of the Iraqians or the Medinans had ever refused to recognise the surpassing authority of the Prophet. It is agreed by all that there is living force in all his commands as well as in his actions. This conclusion mirrors the whole of Muslim outlook in this respect.

2. The recording of the hadīth

As regards the recording of the hadīth there is ample evidence on both the sides, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs, that the Prophet himself had given a start to the recording of the traditions. It is true that, in his own time, his permission to record his instructions, in writing, was limited to some of his Companions (or to his Family members, as the

[1] al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1. p.39.

Shīʿīs believe) but it is a fact that these written instructions carried authoritative value in his own time and afterwards. We give here a brief sketch of each School's recording of the hadīth.

i. The Sunnī Evidence

The Prophet gave some of his instructions to the people of Yaman, in written form. These instructions related Farāʾiḍ (the orders for compulsory duties), Sunan (the better actions) and the types of bloodwit. He had them written by his Companions and sent them with ʿAmr b. Ḥazm, the Companion (53 A.H.). The eminent traditionist al-Zuhrī (124 A.H.) states that he had read that book of the Prophet[1]. Mālik, the Imām (179 A.H.), also mentions this book[2], and Jamāl al-Dīn al-Zaylaʿī (762 A.H.) writes[3] that this book has been recognised by the four Imāms (of the Sunnī School).

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr, the Companion (65 A.H.), had also compiled a collection of the instructions of the Prophet. This he did with the permission[4] of the Prophet and had named that book Al-Ṣādiqah[5]. Al-Tirmidhī mentions[6] this book of ʿAbd Allāh, and al-ʿAsqalānī states that the grandson of ʿAbd Allāh, ʿAmr b. Shuʿayb (120 A.H.), had inherited that collection of his grandfather[7].

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar (73 A.H.) reports that there was another book Kitāb al-Ṣadaqāt[8] regarding taxes which the Prophet had written. ʿAlī also had a book which contained the instructions of the Prophet regarding taxes; it was not confined to taxes but it also contained many other things. Al-Bukhārī refers to this booklet in various chapters[9] of his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ.

[1] See, al-Nasāʾī, op.cit., v.2. p.251.
[2] See, Mālik, op.cit., v.2. p.181.
[3] See, al-Zaylaʿī, op.cit., v.2. p.342.
[4] See, Ibn Saʿd, Al-Ṭabaqāt, v.4. p.8, al-Khaṭṭābī, Maʿālim al-Sunan, v.4. p.184.
[5] See, al-Dārimī, op.cit., v.1. p.127.
[6] See, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.1. p.43, 82.
[7] See, al-ʿAsqalānī, Tahdhīb, v.8. p.49.
[8] See, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.1.p.79
[9] See, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1. p.38, v.3. p.26, v.4 p.122, v.9. p.16, 120.

The collections made by ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd (32 A.H.), Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh (74 A.H.), Samurah b. Jundub (59. A.H.), and ʿAbd Allāh b. Abbās (68 A.H.), the Companions, are also noteworthy. The collection of Ibn Masʿūd was found with his son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān[1]. Qatādah, the Successor (107 A.H.), had learnt the collection of Jābir by heart[2]. Sulaymān the son of Samurah transmitted the collection of his father[3]. ʿIkrimah, the Successor (107 A.H.) mentions the writings of Ibn ʿAbbās[4]. We also find a reference to a collection of Saʿd b. ʿUbādah, the Companion (15 A.H.), and we see that his son transmitted traditions of the Prophet from the collection of his father[5]. The eminent traditionist Sufyān transmitted the traditions of Jābir, the Companion, from Jābir's own collection[6].

These are some of the early collections to which reference is occasionally made in the later collections of ḥadīth. These were not made to preserve the traditions nor to convey them to the next generations but they were mostly written to help their memories and to guide their own narration. The main basis for the later transmission were men's memories and these writings were designed to set their memories right. Some scholars like Muḥammad b. Sīrīn (110 A.H.), having learnt the traditions by heart, destroyed their writings[7]. Such carefulness eventually led to the requirement for a better procedure of compilation but it is an established fact that the collections of the early days were the basis for the latter collections; and the compilation of later big works of ḥadīth did not merely depend upon the memories of the transmitters but there were also some manuscripts behind them.

[1] See, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Jāmiʿ Bayān al-ʿIlm, v.1. p.72.
[2] See, al-Dhahabī, op. cit., v.1. p.116.
[3] See, al-ʿAsqalānī, op.cit., v.4. p.198, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.1. p.155.
[4] See, al-Tirmidhī, Kitāb al-ʿIlal, v.2. p.238.
[5] See, al-Tirmidhī, Al-Sunan, v.1. p.160.
[6] Al-ʿAsqalānī, op.cit., v.5. p.27.
[7] See, Ibn Saʿd, op.cit., v.7. p.141.

The eminent Successors also stepped in the shoes of the Companions. The students of Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), like Bashīr and Hammām b. Munabbih, recorded what they heard[1] from their teacher. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim had also used[2] such collections. Saʿīd b. Jubayr (95 A.H.) recorded the traditions of his teachers ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar and ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās[3]. Nāfiʿ (117 A.H.) wrote from his master ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar (73 A.H.)[4]. The writings of Abū Zinād (131 A.H.) and al-Zuhrī (124 A.H.) are also considered among the collections of the scholar Successors. Al-Zuhrī[5] had compiled the traditions in compliance with the orders of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al- ʿAzīz (100 A.H.). Al-Bukhārī reports that ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al- ʿAzīz wrote also to Abū Bakr b. Ḥazm[6] to compile the traditions. The early systematic works and the later canonical books are essentially a developed form of these early collections.

Al-Tirmidhī mentions[7] Hishām b. Ḥisān (147 A.H.), ʿAbd al-Mālik b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Jurayj (150 A.H.), Saʿīd b. Abī ʿArūbah (156 A.H.), Mālik b. Anas (179 A.H.), Ḥammād b. Salamah (176 A.H.), ʿAbd Allāh b. Mubārak (156 A.H.), Yahyā b. Zakariyā (184 A.H.), Wakīʿ b. al-Jarrāḥ (197 A.H.), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Mahdī (198 A.H.) and some other men of knowledge and learning among the authors of the early times who compiled the works on traditions in distinctive forms.

The works of Maʿmar b. Rāshid (153 A.H.), al-Awzāʿī (156 A.H.), Shuʿbah b. al-Ḥajjāj (160 A.H.), al-Rabīʿ b. al-Ṣabīḥ (160 A.H.), Sufyān al-Thawrī (161 A.H.), al-Layth al-Miṣrī (175 A.H.), Abū Yūsuf al-Qāḍī (182 A.H.), Jarīr b. ʿAbd al-Hamīd (188 A.H.), Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (189 A.H.), Sufyān b. ʿUyainah (198 A.H.) and ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. al-Hammām (211 A.H.) are also the distinctive authors of the early works of ḥadīth.

[1]See, al-Dārimī, op.cit., v.1. p.127.
[2]See, al-Dhahabī, op.cit., v.1. p.95.
[3]See, al-Dārimi, op.cit., v.1. p.127.
[4]See, ibid., v.1. p.129
[5]See, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, op.cit., v.1. p.76.
[6]See, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1. p.36.
[7]See, al-Tirmidhī, Kitāb al- ʿIlal, v.2. p.235.

The proximity of these authors to the early period led them to compile what they received from their teachers and the other transmitters, whether it was mursal (bearing interrupted chain) or muttaṣil (bearing uninterrupted chain of transmitters). The traditions from the Companions and the scholar Successors are also frequently found in these collections as indicating the living practice of the 'good times'. The Muwaṭṭā' of Mālik is considered to be the best book of this period.

Then the art of compilation developed and the traditionists looked towards the scrutiny of the chains, the continuity between the transmitters and the classes of the transmitters (Ṭabaqāt al-Ruwāt). The six canonical books were compiled with these careful criteria and this is especially true of the Al-Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī and the Al-Ṣaḥīḥ of Muslim. These two works of ḥadīth are quite safe[1] from forgeries. The objections that have generally been raised need more careful study of the concerned reports.

[1]We do not agree with Alfred Guillaume in his assessment that there is evidence of untrustworthiness of the guarantors of the ḥadīth even in Al-Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī. Guillaume refers to Kitāb al-Ṣayd of the Al-Ṣaḥīḥ and states that the Prophet gave the order to kill all dogs except hunting dogs and sheep dogs. Abū Hurayrah transmitted the exception of farm-dogs also. On being informed of Abū Hurayrah's report Ibn ʿUmar remarked that the former owned cultivated land. Guillaume concludes that Abū Hurayrah himself had added the third exception and transmitted that in name of the Prophet. (See, Guillaume, The Traditions of Islām, p.78). Originally Goldziher had pointed out to these remarks of Ibn ʿUmar and Guillaume has stepped in the shoes of the former. Such events need to have more carefully been examined. Al-Bukhārī discusses this issue in the Kitāb al-Muzāraʿat of his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ also where we find another Companion transmitting from the Prophet in a similar context that the farm-dogs can be kept. (See, v.3. p.136). ʿAbd Allāh b. Mughaffal another Companion (60 A.H.) also reports that the Prophet had made three exceptions, the sheep dog, the hunting dog and the farm-dog. (See, Muslim, op.cit., v.5. p.36). So the comment of Ibn ʿUmar did not intend to cast suspicion or rejection upon the report of Abū Hurayrah who is not alone in transmission of that exception; but he meant to stress the cause of the latter's sound memory in that respect because first hand knowledge is always fresh. This explanation finds support in Ibn ʿUmar's own transmission of that third exception (See, ibid, v.5. p.37). For such reasons we disagree with Goldziher in his rejection of the report of Abū Hurayrah. (See, Goldziher, op.cit., v.2. p.56). Similarly

footnote[1] (continued)

debatable is Goldziher's rejection of the report of al-Bukhārī that: 'if it was decreed that there would be a prophet after Muḥammad his son Ibrāhīm would have lived': (See, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8. p.54). Goldziher rejects this tradition on the basis of its hereditary colour and supports his rejection by the comments of some of the eminent scholars of Islām. (See, Goldziher, op.cit., p.104). God's selection of His prophets from among certain dynasties does not suggest any hereditary character of prophethood. The Qur'ān refers to Ibrāhīm's prayer to God that He may raise the Imām from his descendants. (See, S2:124, 129). Although it is not necessary, it is true that Yūsuf Ya'qūb, Isḥaq and Ibrāhīm, the prophets, were fathers and sons. Sulaymān had stepped in the shoes of his father Dā'ūd, the prophet. (See, S27:16). On the same line the tradition says that if there had been any prophet after Muḥammad his son Ibrāhīm would have lived and become a prophet and this expression does not bear any hereditary colour. Moreover there is no idea of the continuity of the prophethood after Muḥammad because the tradition asserts that after Muḥammad no prophethood had ever been decreed. Ibn Mājah transmits another tradition which gives an idea of the continuity of the prophethood: 'If Ibrāhīm had lived he would certainly have been a prophet. (See, Ibn Mājah, op.cit., v.1. p.237). This version apparently contradicts the fundamental doctrine of Muḥammad's being the seal of the prophets. The report of al-Bukhārī is authentic and correctly traced back to 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Awfā; but the report of Ibn Mājah is based on the authority of Ibrāhīm b.'Uthmān Abū Shaybah al-wāsiṭī who is 'munkar al-ḥadīth'. (See, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.1. p.191). Goldziher attacks the report of al-Bukhārī and argues by the comments of Ibn 'Abd al-Barr and al-Nawawī which really relate the report of Ibn Mājah and do not impugn the report of al-Bukhārī which is correct in all respects. We do not agree with Goldziher's statement that the sentence: 'If Ibrāhīm had lived he would have been a prophet': is based on the authority of three of Muḥammad's Companions. We find this sentence only from Ibn 'Abbās and that also is not correctly traced back to Ibn 'Abbās. We have referred to this report in footnote 4, on page 171 of this thesis.

Al-Bukhārī had already gone through some of the early works of ḥadīth. He used[1] the collection of Hammām b. Munabbih, the student of Abū Hurayrah, and heard the Jāmiʿ of Sufyān al-Thawrī (161 A.H.) from Abū Ḥafs Kabīr[2]. Al-Bukhārī's teacher Isḥāq b. Rāhwayh (238 A.H.) had suggested to him that he should compile such a work. The chapter-headings (the abwāb) under which al-Bukhārī places the tradition show what legal thoughts he had on that issue. In order to ascertain the outlook of al-Bukhārī it is important to have a careful study of these chapter-headings. He completed his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ in sixteen years and presented it for perusal to his teachers, Yaḥyā b. Muʿīn (233 A.H.), ʿAlī b. Madīnī (234 A.H.) and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, the Imām (241 A.H.).

In light of this historical background of the recording of the ḥadīth the Al-Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī stands as the foremost work of the Sunnī traditionists. This book depicts the basic legal and also doctrinal outlook of the Sunnī School of thought; thus, if we comment upon his approach in light of the approach of his other co-religionists, the basic emphasis of Sunnī doctrine can be mirrored.

Alongside this brief sketch of how the traditions were first recorded in writing among the Sunnīs and how the direct and indirect transmission emerged from the early collections of ḥadīth we may give here an account of the first Shīʿī collections and we may produce Shīʿī evidence on this issue.

ii. The Shīʿī Evidence

We have already noted[3] in the Sunnī collections of ḥadīth that there was a book of traditions compiled by ʿAlī which he kept wrapped in the handle of his sword. In Shīʿī literature of ḥadīth also the same book has been referred to. According to the Shīʿīs, ʿAlī, the First Imām,

[1]See, al-Dhahabī, op.cit., v.1. 95.

[2]See, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, op.cit., v.2. p.11.

[3]See, p. 15.

was the first who initiated the recording of the traditions. The book of ʿAlī is considered as being the dictation of the Prophet and the writing of ʿAlī[1]. Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, asserts that it was the writing of ʿAlī and the dictation of the Prophet[2]. There is ample evidence that this book had been existing with the Shīʿī Imāms and they frequently referred[3] to it.

There is mention of some other books also, relating to that period, in the Shīʿī literature of ḥadīth. One of them is <u>Kitāb al-Farāʾiḍ</u>[4] of ʿAlī, the First Imām. There was another book entitled as <u>Muṣḥaf Fāṭimah</u>[5]. In this book there is some information regarding the hereafter and there are some predictions. It deals rather with what Fāṭimah, the daughter of the Prophet, directly received from Jibrīl, after the death of her father. Although this book does not directly deal with the Sunnah of the Prophet, mention to it is often found in the late Shīʿī works on ḥadīth. Then there is mention of a book possessed by Umm Salamah, the wife of the Prophet, known as <u>Ṣaḥīfah Umm Salamah</u>[6]. It is probably the same book introduced as the Book of ʿAlī but as it remained with Umm Salamah for a short period it seems to have obtained this new name. The <u>Jafar Abyaḍ</u>[7] is another book known as 'white leather Cover' and

[1]See, al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1. p.57, 242.

[2]See, al-Najjāshī, <u>Rijāl</u>, p.255.

[3]See, al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1. p.57, 242, v.2.p.278, 484, 486, 666, v.3. p.9, 31, 175, 253, 387, 505, 539, v.4. p.368, 389, 390, v.5. p.136, 279, 541. v.6. p.202, 207, 219, 220, 232, 246, 255, v.7. p.35, 40, 48, 77, 93, 95, 98, 112, 119, 139, 176, 201, 214, 216, 317, 329, 414, 415, 436. v.8. p.131, 395.

[4]See, <u>ibid</u>., v.7. p.330-343. This book existed in the time of al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, and it was he who attested the authority of that Book.

[5]See, <u>ibid</u>., v.1. p.241, al-Ṣuddūq, <u>op.cit</u>., p.103.

[6]See, al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1. p.235.

[7]See, <u>ibid</u>., v.1. p.239.

then there are the writings of Abū Rāfiʿ [1], Salmān, Abū Dharr and Aṣbagh b. Nubātah[2]. The Ṣaḥīfah of Asmāʾ bint ʿUmays (38 A.H.) is not noteworthy because most of the Shīʿī critics do not recognise it[3].

After these early writings, we find that Zayn al-ʿAbidīn, the Fourth Imām, wrote down Al-Ṣaḥīfat al-Kāmilah[4]. Abū Ḥamzah, a companion of his, made a copy of that collection. Then there come the writings of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq, the Fifth and the Sixth Imāms. The later Imāms have attested the previous records of the traditions and verified what was wrong and what was right. It is appropriate to mention here that according to the Shīʿī Faith the traditions of the Imāms are considered[5] as the traditions coming down from the Prophet and the Imāms are accepted as being the true heirs of their ancestors. The Shīʿīs believe in the Divine Status of the Imāms and claim that their Imāms were divinely protected from sins and slips and their attestation of any tradition or any collection of traditions is final and authoritative. Moreover they believe that the Imām had

[1] The name of Abū Rāfiʿ was Aslam and he was Qibṭī by race. He worked as Financial Secretary to ʿAlī at Kūfah. His two sons were ʿAlī's draftmen. (See, al-Najjāshī, op.cit., p.3.). The name of Abū Rāfiʿ's collection was Kitāb al-Sunan wa al-Aḥkām wa al-Qaḍāyā. Abū Rāfiʿ's collection has later been mentioned as being the collection of ʿUbayd Allāh, the son of Abū Rāfiʿ (See, Ibn Shahr, Maʿālim al-ʿUlamāʾ p.1).

[2] Ibn Shahr Āshub (588 A.H.) mentions the last three compilers as the first, the second and the third compilers of traditions after ʿAlī. (See, Ibn Shahr Āshūb, op.cit., p.1.)

[3] We agree with Goldziher that although some of the Shīʿī historians mention this Ṣaḥīfah of Asmāʾ but for its authenticity there is no firm basis. The same is the case with the book of ʿUmāra b. Ziyād who never existed and the books linked to his name must be spurious. (See, Goldziher, op.cit., v.2. p.23-4).

[4] See, al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8. p.14.

[5] See, ibid., v.1. p.53, v.7. p.85. This finds support in ibid., v.4. p.187 also.

inherited the Book of ʿAlī, the First Imām, which covered all the subjects and embraced all the issues; and according to their belief it was actually the dictation of the Prophet. So the Imām's attestation was not under the shadow of any suspicion.

The Shīʿī books of Rijāl (biographies of the transmitters of the traditions) mention many other compilers of ḥadīth among the Companions of the Imāms. As to those who compiled books, their collections fall into two categories, the Uṣūl (fundamental collections) and the kutub (the books). The list given by al-Ṭūsī (460 A.H.) comprises 892 compilers and the list provided by Rashīd al-Dīn Ibn Shahr Āshūb (588 A.H.) gives 990 names. The fundamental collections upon which the later traditionists base their works, according to the statement of Shaykh al-Mufīd (413 A.H.), number some four hundred[1] and these are known as Uṣūl.

The basis of the early Shīʿī scholars of ḥadīth were the books which the trustowrthy Companions of the Imāms had transmitted from their Imāms. What they had heard from their Imāms they preserved in the books[2]. There is evidence that at times these collections were presented[3] to the Imāms and they verified them. The Companions did not permit any transmission until they were sure of its accuracy. So if some of the traditions prove mursal (bearing an interrupted chain of transmitters) this is not harmful[4] because the trustworthy Companions have acknowledged these traditions. There was another section of the scholar Companions, such as Muḥammad b. Abī ʿUmayr, Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā, Ḥammād b. ʿIsā and al-Bazanṭī who put those books in order[5] and in a practical code of arrangement. These fundamental collections were the basis for the Shīʿī Faith and Practice until these emerged into the developed form of later canonical works of ḥadīth.

[1] See, Ibn Shahr Āshūb, op.cit., p.1.

[2] See, al-Taqī al-Majlisī, Sharḥ al-Faqīh, v.1. p.32.

[3] See, al-Māmaqānī, op.cit., v.1. p.179.

[4] See, al-Taqī al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1. p.33. [5] See, ibid., v.1. p.32.

All the Shīʿīs agreed to act upon these fundamental collections and whatever al-Kulaynī (328 A.H.), al-Ṣuddūq (381 A.H.) and al-Ṭūsī (460 A.H.) have given in the four canonical books of ḥadīth they have taken from these four hundred books. Al-Ṣuddūq has mentioned that he has taken the material for his work from these fundamental collections; and al-Ṭūsī has also stated this at the end of his works, Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām and Istibṣār. As for al-Kulaynī, although he does not acknowledge that he took material for his work from the above-mentioned early collections, nevertheless, on consultation of his work, the late Shīʿī scholars of ḥadīth are confident and even certain[1] for various reasons that he had taken material for his work from the above mentioned Uṣūl, the early fundamental collections. There are references[2] in Al-Kāfī which indicate that there were some early collections from which al-Kulaynī sought help. Moreover he, at places, transmits from some of those transmitters whom he never met[3]. This suggests that he took those traditions from the early collections and transmitted them on the basis of the reliability of the early sources. This shows that he did not work merely from memory.

However this state of affairs does not affect the authenticity of Al-Kāfī as it has been described as having been approved by the twelfth Imām, al-Mahdī the hidden Imām. Al-Kulaynī compiled this book during the 'Minor Occultation' of the twelfth Imām which lasted for 64 years and ended in 328 A.H., and it was in the same year that al-Kulaynī died. During this Occultation the Envoys represented the Imām and the eminent traditionists availed themselves of the guidance of the hidden Imām through these Envoys. It was considered a mark of merit that any work should have been compiled in that period. This approval of the Imām could easily override all discrepancies in the chains of

[1] See, ibid., v.1. p.59.

[2] Al-Kulaynī introduces Ibn Jarīr al-Qummī as Muḥammad b. ʿUbayd Allāh and then says: 'In one manuscript it is ʿAbd Allāh': (See, al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8. p.290).

[3] For instance he never met Abū Baṣīr but he transmits many traditions from him.

the transmitters and their reliability. This explains why al-Kulaynī did not need to be duly concerned for the correctness of the chains. This position of Al-Kāfī as compared with other canonical books of the Shīʿī traditions is distinctive and surpassing.

In light of the aforesaid state of affairs Al-Kāfī is regarded as the fore-most authentic collection, the Shīʿī traditionists have ever produced and al-Kulaynī is eventually the chief traditionist of the Shīʿī School. His work mirrors the whole doctrinal position as well as the practical side of the main sect of the Shīʿīs and it may almost be said to occupy the same prestigious position among them which the Al-Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī occupies among the Sunnīs.

A comparison between the works of these two chief traditionists of the two major schools of Islām reflects almost the whole spectrum of Islām and many of its different interpretations, especially when the reports and discussions of their respective co-religionists are also taken into account. This explains why these two eminent scholars of ḥadīth, al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī, have been selected to reflect fundamental points of departure for the doctrinal developments of the two Schools.

However this Foreword, for which ample evidence has been produced in our previous thesis, confirms the legal authoritative status of the Prophet and confirms the historical authenticity of the ḥadīth literature in Islām; it provides a background for better understanding of the present thesis, depicting why, to explore Muslim dogmatics, we have drawn on the all-embracing corpus of ḥadīth literature of the two major schools of Islām.

Chapter I. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SUNNĪ AND SHĪʿĪ DISPUTES.

1. The Qurʾānic prediction of doctrinal disputes.

The Qurʾān predicts what would be the causes of doctrinal disputes among the Muslims and how wrong it is to be led astray. There are instructions to overcome the dissension and it does not allow one to go far from the right path of God.

i. The following of the Mutashābihāt (the allegorical verses).

The Qurʾān says:

> He it is Who has revealed the Book to you; there are some verses which are muḥkamāt (the decisive); they are the basis of the book; and the other verses are mutashābihāt (the allegorical). Then those in whose hearts there is perversity follow the allegorical verses (in isolation) seeking to mislead and seeking to achieve their (own) objective; and none knows its objective save God; and those who have acquired profundity in knowledge say, 'We believe in it, it is all from our Lord; and no one remembers but those of insight.'[1]

The muḥkamāt and mutashābihāt have been differently interpreted. Al-Khaṭṭābī (388 A.H.) gives a very comprehensive conclusion:

> Al-muḥkam in the Qurʾān refers to the verses which give perfect knowledge and are to be acted upon; and al-mutashābih is concerned only with belief and its apparent knowledge; and this is implied in God's Word 'and none knows its objective save God'.[2]

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) quotes various explanations and then states:

> The authentic interpretation is that muḥkam requires two things: (first) there should be clear meanings in which there is no complication and no other parallel meaning and (secondly),

1. S 3:6.
2. Al-Khaṭṭābī, Maʿālim al-Sunan, v.4, p.331.

> their composition, directly or by interpretation, should have had some definite result; and mutashābih also involves two things: first there should be some parallel conflicting meaning and secondly there are the names which are common on various purports... As regards the Attributes of God, the mutashābihāt are the verses which apparently suggest some direction (for Him) and likeness (with human beings) and require some interpretation (other than the apparent meaning).[1]

There are some verses which are not actually mutashābihāt but there is some ambiguity in them. These can be referred to the decisive verses and interpreted in the light of them. These verses then no longer contain any ambiguity;[2] but if they are interpreted in isolation they do result in disputation. The actual mutashābihāt are essentially allegorical; they could have a literal meaning but their modes are unknown to the believers. Belief in them is required but enquiry into them is discouraged. Ibn Hammām al-Iskandarī (861 A.H.) states:

> The complete knowledge of what cannot be expected in this world is mutashābih such as knowledge of the Qualities (of God), i.e. The Hand, The Eye and the Actions as God's descent (from the throne); knowledge of the isolated letters (muqaṭṭaʿāt) in the beginnings of the Sūrahs.[3]

The Sunnī traditionists believe that if the Attributes of God are interpreted metaphorically, they are robbed of all their

1. Al-Nawawī, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, v.2, p.339.
2. The Qur'ān says: 'if you fall into dispute about anything, refer it to God and the Prophet' (S4:59). This suggests that there is no real contradiction between the Qur'ān and the Prophet's statement, as the disputed thing cannot overcome the dissension and solve the dispute; the disputed thing should be referred to the undisputed. Al-Shāṭibī (790 A.H.) claims that there is no real contradiction in the Sharīʿah, neither in the Uṣūl (fundamentals) nor in the Furūʿ (applications). (Al-Muwāfaqāt, v.4, p.119).
3. Ibn Hammām, Al-Taḥrīr, p.49.

contents. They could have a literal meaning, but as regards the modes of these Qualities, they are generally believed to be unknown.[1] These are really the allegorical verses of the Qur'ān and they are mostly concerned with dogmatics where there is nothing to act upon. Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.) reports the Prophet as saying:

> Act upon al-muḥkam and have belief in al-mutashābih.[2]

'Āishah, the Mother of the Faithful, reports that the Prophet recited the earlier-quoted verse in full, and then said:

> When you see those who study what is allegorical in the Qur'ān, those are they whom God named (the people of perversity), so be on your guard against them.[3]

This tradition indicates that the Prophet himself felt some anxiety about the people's indulging in these allegorical discussions. The Qur'ān and the Prophet predict that the allegorical verses of the Qur'ān would be the basis of dissension and disputation if they were interpreted without reference to the decisive verses and the fundamentals of Qur'ānic instructions, or if any attempt was made to interpret their modes which are known only to God.

Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī, the chief Shī'ī traditionist, adds that those who do not discriminate the repealed instructions from the repealing ones also come into this category. He transmits from the Prophet as follows:

> As for one who acted upon the conclusion of analogy, he perished and led others to perish; and as for one who gave his verdict without knowledge and could not discriminate the nāsikh

1. These verses are not completely unknown; it is essentially known in regard to these Attributes and Qualities of God that there is no likeness and similarity between Him and the created ones. Ibn al-Qayyim (751 A.H.) says, 'The man who proved to Him the realities of the Names and the Attributes and observed negation of all that is similar to the created things, such a one is rightly guided by God to the Straight Path. Kitāb al-Rūḥ, p.321.
2. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, Mishkāt, p.31.
3. Al-Bukhārī, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, v.6, p.42.

(the repealing one) from the mansūkh (the repealed one) and the muḥkam (the decisive) from the mutashābih (the allegorical), he too perished and led others to perish.[1]

ʿAlī, the First Imām, extends this idea of the two series of the verses of the Qurʾān to the traditions. He says:

> The instructions of the Prophet have also, like the Qurʾān, the categories of 'the repealing' and 'the repealed', the particular and the general, and the decisive and the allegorical.[2]

Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (381 A.H.), the eminent Shīʿī traditionist, reports the Prophet as saying:

> With regard to my people I fear only three affairs; firstly that they give the Qurʾān another interpretation; secondly that they pursue the mistake of the ʿĀlim (one who knows); and thirdly that they become rich so that they grow conceited; and I shall tell you how to get rid of these affairs. As regards the Qurʾān act upon its muḥkam and have belief in its mutashābih. As regards the ʿĀlim, wait for his retrieval and do not pursue his mistake; and as regards ~~the~~ wealth, know that gratitude of bliss and fulfilment of right save from its other results.[3]

This report bears evidence that mutashābihāt are not to be acted upon but it is required to believe in them; otherwise they would be the basis of dissension and disputation. The Sunnī traditionist Abū Dāʾūd (275 A.H.) also transmits a similar report that there will be the people who will give the Qurʾān another interpretation.[4] Besides this there are some other causes of Muslims' falling in dispute.

1. Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, v.1, p.43.
2. ibid, v.1, p.63.
3. Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Khiṣāl, v.1, p.78.
4. Abū Dāʾūd, Kitāb al-Marāsīl, p.2.

ii. The following of the parallel streams of thought.

The Qur'ān mentions another cause of Muslims' falling into dispute. It warns against the parallel ways and states that the Muslims' attachment to the ways of others will lead them away from their own path and divide them into parties.

> And (know) this is My Path, the right one; therefore follow it, and follow not the other ways, for they will lead you away from His way.[1]

The Prophet also referred to this as one of the causes of dissension. ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion (32 A.H.) says:

> The Prophet drew a line for us and then said, 'This is the Path of God'. The Prophet then drew several lines on its right and left and said, 'These are the paths (subul) on each of which there is a devil who invites people to that'. The Prophet then recited, 'And this is My Path, the right one.'[2]

The Prophet in another tradition states the reason for their deviation from the right path as the following of the parallel ways. Abū Saʿīd, the Companion, (74 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> You will certainly follow the practices of the early communities, span by span and cubit by cubit; so that if they enter a lizard's hole you will follow them.

He was then asked if he meant the Jews and the Christians, and he replied as follows:

> Then who else.[3]

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr, the Companion (67 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

1. S 6:154.
2. Al-Dārimī, Al-Sunan, V.1, p.67.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., V.9, p.126.

> Indeed, there will happen to my people what happened to the children of Isrā'īl step by step...; the children of Isrā'īl were divided into seventy-two divisions and my people will be divided into seventy-three factions, all of which but one will go to hell.

On being asked which that was, the Prophet replied:

> It is the one to which I and my Companions belong.[1]

The Shī'ī traditionist Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (381 A.H.) also reports the Prophet as saying:

> Indeed, my people will divide into seventy-two factions; seventy-one will perish and one sect will escape.

On being asked which that was, the Prophet said:

> The Union, The Union, The Union.[2] (al-jamā'ah)

The reason given for this deviation of the Muslims is 'following in the tracks of Isrā'īl' but one must ask what was the reason for Isrā'īl's division into sects, which ultimately caused the Muslims too to be divided. The Qur'ān says:

> And the people to whom the Book had been given did not divide themselves but out of envy among themselves.[3]

Abū 'Āliyah, the eminent Successor (40 A.H.) explains the basis of this envy as being the advantages of worldly power and worldly delights.[4]

iii. Men's being divided into sects explained in terms of God's chastisement.

There is another cause of Muslims' being divided into sects.

1. Al-Tirmidhī, Al-Sunan, v.2, p.107. 'Alī b. al-Madīnī (234 A.H.) says that the traditionists are ever on the right path. (Al-Tabrīzī, op.cit, p.584).
2. Ibn Bābawayh, op.cit., v.2, p.141. Al-'Ayyāshī, the Shī'ī traditionist reports the division of the community into seventy-three factions (See, al-Ṭabarsī, Abū 'Alī Majma' al-Bayān, v.9, p.503.
3. S 3:18.
4. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jāmi' Bayān al-'Ilm, v.2, p.85.

The Qur'ān says:

> Say He has the Power that He should send on you a Chastisement from above you; or from beneath your feet; or that He should throw you into confusion, dividing you into different parties.[1]

Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports that when this verse was revealed the Prophet said that he took refuge by the Face of God from the first and the second Chastisement and said that this (the third) was comparatively easier.[2]

Al-Bukhārī uses the last words of this verse of the Qur'ān (or He should throw you into confusion) as the Chapter-heading to the above-quoted tradition. The heading of the preceding chapter is as follows:

> The saying of the Prophet that there will not cease to be found among his people those who uphold the Truth; they shall fight (against evil); and they would be a group of learned men.[3]

Al-Bukhārī suggests in this Chapter-heading that the Prophet predicts here that his people will fall into confusion, form different factions and there would certainly be one which will uphold the truth. In the next chapter he states the reason for this confusion and disputation; and he suggests that this division and friction was a form of chastisement.

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), says that 'the parties' here, in this verse, mean the people of selfish motives and 'throwing into confusion' and falling in disputes mean that one of them may declare the other to be an unbeliever as the Khawārij did against ʿAlī.[4] Al-Bukhārī says that the Khawārij misused the Qur'ān and the verses which related to the unbelievers were applied by them to the believers who opposed them. Al-Bukhārī gives the following report of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar in one of his Chapter-headings:

1. S 6:65.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, pp.125, 148.
3. ibid, v.9, pp.124-5.
4. Al-Shāṭibī, Kitāb al-Iʿtiṣām, v.1, p.39.

> The Khawārij turned to the verses which were revealed in relation to the non-believers and they applied them to the Muslims.[1]

2. The attitude of Islām in regard to the division of the Community.

i. The Qur'ānic instructions not to divide into sects.

The Qur'ān lays emphasis on the communal unity and does not allow the Muslims to fall into disputes and divide into sects. The Qur'ān regards unity among the community as the favour of God:

> And hold fast by the Covenant of God all to-gether and be not disunited and remember the favour of God on you when you were enemies then He united your hearts. So by His favour you became brethren.[2]

Moreover, the Qur'ān instructs men that the matter of dispute should be consigned to God, and it does not favour indulgence in dispute and division.
The Qur'ān says:

> And in whatever thing you disagree, the judgement thereof is (in) God's (hand), that is my Lord, on Him do I rely and to Him I turn time after time.[3]
> And establish Religion and be not divided therein.[4]

ii. The Prophet's disagreement with division into sects:

The Qur'ān keeps the Prophet above all the party-disputes and says:

> Surely as for those who divided up their religion and became sects, you have no concern with them; their affair is only with God; then He will inform them of what they did.[5]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.20.
2. S 3:1-2.
3. S 42:10.
4. S 42:13.
5. S 6:160; S 30:32.

The Prophet always discouraged dissension and disputation especially in doctrinal disputes. Al-Bukhārī lays down the Chapter-heading, 'Abomination of disputes' and reports Jundub b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion (68 A.H.), as transmitting the following instructions of the Prophet:

> Recite the Qurʾān as long your hearts are united. When you fall into dispute give it up.[1]

Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), reports that once the Prophet came to them when they (the Companions) were arguing about God's decree. He was displeased and his face turned so red that it looked as if a pomegranate had been burst open on his cheeks. The Prophet, then, said:

> Is it this to which you were commanded, or was it for this purpose that I was sent to you? Your predecessors perished only when they argued about it. I have decided for you not to dispute in this affair.[2]

iii. The Companions' disagreement with division into sects.

ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, warned the Companions against falling into disputes as follows:

> You, who were present at the battle of Badr, are disputing; if you fall into dispute the people coming after you will dispute on a large scale.[3]

ʿUmar once asked ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās as to why, when there is one Prophet, one Qiblah and one Book, the Muslims will fall into dispute? He answered:

> O Commander of the Faithful! The Qurʾān was revealed before us and we know the occasions of its descent. But there will be people in future who will read the Qurʾān but they will not have rightly known the occasions of its descent and its origins. They will then give their own opinions and hazard a guess, so they will fall into dispute and this disputation will then amount to quarrels.[4]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.136.
2. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.19.
3. Ibn al-Qayyim, Iʿlām al-Mūqiʿīn, v.1, p.64.
4. Al-Shāṭibī, op.cit., v.1, p.157.

Al-Bukhārī reports ʻAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as writing to his judges:

> Take decisions as you had been doing (in the time of my predecessors); as I do not like disputation until they agree, all of them. I wish that I may pass away as my predecessors passed away without my seeing dissension.[1]

ʻAbd Allāh b. Masʻūd, the eminent scholar among the Companions (32 A.H.), states:

> The people will never cease to be in a good state so long as they receive knowledge from their ancestors. When they acquire knowledge from their juniors and from wicked persons they will perish.[2]

This is a warning against the grave dissensions likely to affect the fundamentals of Islām. As regards the theological differences of the Companions they are not considered as influencing the basic principles. The Prophet regards all of the Companions as being in the right.

(a) The differences among the Companions.

The Prophet asked his Lord in respect of his Companions' differences and He revealed to him:

> Your Companions, O Muḥammad, according to me are in the position of stars in the sky, some brighter than others, but all possessing light. So I consider everyone who holds to either side of an issue about which they differ to be rightly guided.

The Prophet then said:

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.5, p.24.

2. Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr, op.cit., v.1, p.158.

> My Companions are like the Stars, so whichever of them you follow you will be rightly guided.[1]

Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abū Bakr (107 A.H.) comments:

> Verily God has benefited (us) by the differences of the Companions in their actions. None acts upon the pattern of any of them but he finds that there is a place for that; and he holds the view that he (the Companion) was better than he who acted upon that.[2]

1. Al-Tabrīzī, op.cit. (with reference to Razīn), p.554. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (460 A.H.) also transmits this tradition from ʿUmar and ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companions, (See Al-Kifāyah, p.48). Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (463 A.H.) also mentioned it (op.cit., v.2, pp.73, 78, 85, 90), but establishes it as a weak (ḍaʿīf) tradition. Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī (of the 5th Century A.H.) also mentions it (Al-Tamhīd, p.84). This frequent mention in the early times suggests that it may be authentic on the basis of its general acceptance although there is some weakness in regard to its chains of transmitters. The Shīʿīs have also accepted its authenticity. Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (381 A.H.) reports the Prophet as saying:

> Verily the position of my Companions among you (all the Community) is like the stars; whichever of them you follow, it is guidance; and, of whichever opinion of my Companions you take hold, you are rightly guided. The difference of my Companions is a blessing for you.

He was further asked who were his Companions? The Prophet answered that they were his Children (Maʿānī al-Akhbār, v.2, pp.156-7).

2. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, op.cit., v.2, p. 80.

Al-Qāsim further reports ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, the Caliph (100 A.H.) as saying:

> I do not desire that the Companions should not have differed (theologically); if they had been at one the people would have suffered hardship as they (the Companions) are the Imāms who are to be followed. If anyone agrees to any of them there is a place for that.[1]

(b) The implied meaning of the Companions' being in the right.

The Companions' being on the right path does not imply that individually everyone of them is in the right and his approach is always correct; right is always one. The implied meaning of the Companions' being on the right path is that everyone of them is rightful in holding that opinion and that their theological differences do not exceed the interpretative limits. No doubt, one of two conflicting opinions must be wrong, but they (the Companions) exercise their judgements in good faith; and within the jurisdiction of ijtihād (analogy) it is right to act upon that. Al-Bukhārī reports that the Prophet says:

> When a judge gives an opinion and he tries his best to decide correctly and he arrives at the right, he will have a double reward; and when he gives a decision having tried his best to decide correctly and is wrong, he will have a single reward.[2]

Qāḍī Ismaʿīl (282 A.H.) regards the differences of the Companions as being the differences of analogy. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (463 A.H.) corroborates this statement and says that it is an excellent opinion.[3] This explanation reconciles the two Sunnī opinions which show Mālik (179 A.H.) and

1. ibid.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.133.
3. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, op.cit., v.2, p.82.

al-Shāfiʿī (204 A.H.) on one side[1] and Abū Ḥanīfah (150 A.H.) and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (240 A.H.) on the other side.

(c) <u>The Shīʿīs' disagreement with decisions based on analogy</u>.

According to the Sunnīs it is required to form an opinion only in those cases on which there is no <u>naṣṣ</u> (clear-cut verdict) of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah; but the Shīʿīs believe that there is no need of any such analogy, because of the continuous Divine Succession of the Prophet. According to them it is impossible for their Imāms to fall into error as they always decide under Divine guidance.

Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> The people of analogy acquire knowledge by <u>qiyās</u> (analogy); the analogies did not provide them (with any good) but (caused them) to be far from the right.[2]

He further reports the Prophet as saying:

> Verily! When there is an innovation after me ~~the~~ belief will be with one friend (of God) from my children.... He will speak by God's revelation and he will declare the right and enlighten that.[3]

1. Mālik and al-Shāfiʿī hold that when there occurs any difference among the Companions one side of the issue is necessarily wrong and the correctness depends upon its conformity with the Qur'ān and the Sunnah; but they do not reject that if an attempt has been made to decide correctly and the right is not arrived at, it also gives a reward. But Abū Ḥanīfah says, 'As regards the Companions of the Prophet I hold to the opinion of anyone of them whomsoever and I do not depart from any of them, but as regards the Successors and the Followers I look into their decisions'. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr says, 'Abū Ḥanīfah establishes the Companions in a position which the others do not hold and I think that he inclines to the apparent meaning of the tradition "my Companions are like stars".' Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal also agrees to this opinion. (See <u>ibid</u>., p.83).
2. Al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.56. This idea finds its support in many other traditions. (See, <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.57; v.4, p.134, 320; v.6, p.92; v.7, p.300).
3. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.54.

We shall discuss this point in detail in the Fourth Chapter. Here we point out that the Sunnī and Shīʿī differences do not fall into the category of the differences based on ~~the~~ analogical conclusions and interpretative measures. It is true that these differences were not fundamental in their primary stage, but the developed forms of the two schools affirm that in most of their doctrines the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs differ on principles; in spite of this, they stand close to each other and this is due to their agreement on the authority of the Qurʾān.

It should also be noted that after the Major Occultation of the 12th Imām, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Mahdī, this dividing factor (between the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs) could not continue and the Shīʿī scholars, in the absence of the Divine Imām, had no recourse but to apply analogy where there was no verdict of the Qurʾān and no tradition from the Prophet and the Divine Imāms.

3. The wave of political differences and their emergence in the doctrinal field.

Despite basic agreement on the authority of the Qurʾān and the Sunnah as the fundamental principles of Islām there spread, in the second half of the first century AH, differences in the various circles of the Muslims in some of their explanations of the Qurʾān and in their approach to the Sunnah of the Prophet. On the death of ʿUthmān, the third Caliph, (36 A.H.), there arose[1] some political issues which led the parties to move their base from Medina to Kūfah (Iraq) and Damascus (Syria). These political disputes then developed ideological variations and later on touched almost every theory and practice of Islām.

1. It is true that at the death of the Prophet there had arisen the difference as to whether the Caliph should be elected from the muhājirūn (immigrants) or from the Anṣār (hosts); but this rift had been quickly bridged. Saʿd b. ʿUbādah in whose house the meeting was held when Abū Bakr was elected had not convened any opposition group. (See Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.5, p.8). ʿAlī had also recognised the authority of Abū Bakr as Caliph (See, ibid, v.5, p.178). Al-Kulaynī corroborates this statement and reports ʿAlī's recognition of Abū Bakr's authority as Caliph. (See, al-Kulayni, op.cit., v.8, p.246.)

ʿAlī's comments upon his difference with Muʿāwiyah indicate that up to that time the theory and practice of Islām had not become a matter of dispute. ʿAlī writes in one of his letters:

> It is apparent that our Lord is One; our Prophet is one; our call to Islām is one; we do not require them (the Syrians) to add anything in their belief nor do they require of us any addition in it; the position is one but we fell into dispute regarding the murder of ʿUthmān and we are acquitted from this charge.[1]

ʿAlī further safeguards the relationship of brotherhood despite the accusations at Siffīn:

> Verily we fell into fighting our brethren in Islām for the deviation, distortion, doubt and misinterpretation which occurred (among us).[2]

ʿAlī, when he proceeded to the battle of Camel (when he fought against ʿĀʾishah, the Mother of the Faithful), declared:

> So verily I shall pierce the wrong until the right emerges out from its side; what is between me and the Quraysh? I swear by God: verily I fought against them when they were kāfirūn (unbelievers) and verily I shall fight against them when they are maftūnūn (discordant).[3]

These statements denote that he did not believe his opponents to be unbelievers nor up to that time had the theory of Islām become a matter of dispute. ʿAlī states that he had received the instructions of the Prophet in this respect. He reports the Prophet as saying:

> Verily the people will be discordant with their wealth after me and they will claim to oblige God with their Islām; and they will expect His favours and deem themselves secured from His assault. They will allow the thing forbidden by Him with false doubts and untrue desires; they will allow khamr (wine) under the name of nabīdh (beverage) ... and ribā (interest) in the name of business.

1. Al-Sharīf,al-Raḍī, Nahj al-Balāghah, v.3, pp.125-6.
2. ibid, v.2, p.3.
3. ibid, v.1, pp.77-8.

ʿAlī then asked the Prophet:

> O Prophet of God! how shall I treat with them? Should I treat them as if they had fallen into *riddah* (apostasy) or as fallen into *fitnah* (discord)?

The Prophet then answered:

> They should be treated as fallen into discord.[1]

ʿAlī refers to this distinction between unbelief and discord in one of his letters. He writes to Muʿāwiyah:

> Verily we and you were on the same level of friendship and unity which you mentioned. So it divided us in the past that we embraced *Islām* and you refused; and now, at present, we are on the straight path and you are creating discord.[2]

This also bears evidence that up to that time there was no doctrinal dispute there.

i. The Qurʾānic dictum for the transgressors.

The Qurʾān does not establish political disputes of believers as involving an ideological or theoretical distinction between belief and unbelief; nor does it put any of the transgressors beyond the pale of Islām. The Qurʾān says:

> And if two parties of the believers quarrel, so make peace between them. So if one of them transgresses, fight the one which transgresses till it turns back to God's command. So if it returns, make peace between them with justice and act equitably.[3]

Al-Kulaynī refers to this verse of the Qurʾān in respect of ʿAlī's battles against the people of Baṣrah (the partisans of ʿĀʾishah) and Damascus (the partisans of Muʿāwiyah). This suggests that he does not establish the the political differences as ~~the~~ doctrinal disputes. Al-Kulaynī reports Ḥafṣ b. Ghiyāth as asking Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq,

1. *ibid*, v.2, p.65.
2. *ibid*, v.3, p.134.
3. *S* 49:9

the Sixth Imām, about the two parties of the believers; one of them was the transgressor and the other the rightful party; then the just defeated the transgressor. The Imām then answered:

> The rightful party is not allowed to chase the retreating, to kill the prisoner and to assault the wounded.[1]

Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, also refers to this verse and reports:

> The Commander of the Faithful commanded on the Day (battle) of Baṣrah: 'Do not imprison their children, do not assault the wounded, do not chase the retreating and, as for one who has shut his door and surrendered his arms, he is safe.'[2]

These traditions of the Imāms suggest that there was no theory of Islām disputed until the time of the Khawārij. It was the Khawārij who became misguided and extremist even though their intentions were good and even though they were sincere. ʿAlī was convinced of their good intentions. ʿAlī says:

> Do not kill the Khawārij after me: For one who has searched for the truth and missed that is not like one who has sought the wrong and succeeded.[3]

This comment of ʿAlī indicates that his differences with Muʿāwiyah were not based on any theory, whereas his differences with the Khawārij had an ideological basis. The Khawārij were the first to dispute on the theory and practice of Islām.

ii. The Prophet's verdict for the transgressors.

The Prophet also predicted the three opponents of ʿAlī under these three titles:

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.5, p.32.
2. ibid, v.5, p.12.
3. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.1, p.103.

> He (ʿAlī) will fight after me against the nākithūn (breakers of compact: Ṭalḥah and Zubayr), the qāsiṭūn (the unjust: Muʿāwiyah and his partisans) and māriqūn (those who strayed from the true religion: the Khawārij).[1]

This tradition points out that the Khawārij are the first who strayed and led others astray from the right path.

The Sunnīs also hold that the differences between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah were the differences between two parties of believers and neither of them had strayed theologically from the true religion. Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as saying in respect of his grandson Ḥasan b. ʿAlī:

> This son of mine is chief and most probably God may reconcile through him the two great parties of the Muslims.[2]

iii. How the political revolt produced theological discussions.

We agree with Elder's conclusion[3] that when the partisans of ʿAlī split and there arose a third party, namely the Khawārij it was their revolt against the ruling powers which produced theological discussion over the distinction between belief and unbelief, the meaning of Islām and what actions make man a great sinner. ʿAlī faced the situation and fought against them at Nahrawān. He fought to safeguard the inner meaning of the Qurʾān and there is a prediction of the Prophet in this connection which is quoted in both the Sunnīs' and Shīʿīs' books. Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

1. Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā al-Irbīlī, Kashf al-Ghummah fī maʿrifat-al-aʾimmah, v.1, p.92, 126; al-Ṣuddūq Ibn Bābawayh, Kitab al-Khiṣāl, v.1, p.71.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.71. The Shīʿī traditionists also relate this tradition (see, Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā al-Irbilī, op.cit., v.2, pp.145, 154, 172, 190). History bears testimony that Ḥasan compromised with Muʿāwiyah and withdrew in his favour. The reconciliation and the conditions of compromise indicate that there was no theological dispute there. (See, ibid, v.2, p.196.
3. See, E.E. Elder in his introduction to al-Taftāzānī's Commentary on the Creed of Islam, p.x. A.J. Wensink also agrees with it. (See, Muslim Creed, p.37).

> There would be one who would fight to safeguard the ta'wīl (inner meaning) of the Qur'ān as I myself fought for the tanzīl (revelation) of the Qur'ān.[1]

The Prophet further said that such a one was one who was mending the shoes, hinting at ʿAlī.

ʿAlī defeated the Khawārij and crushed them on the battlefield, but those who escaped advocated their views with full liberty; and ʿAlī advised his partisans not to kill them;[2] and gave them the full benefit of the doubt. Freedom for ideological discussions allowed the people of Iraq to discuss predestination, God's justice, and other dogmatic issues; their different view-points later developed into the various ideologies of the Muʿtazilīs, the Qadarīs, the Murjiʾīs and the Jahmīs. The first centre of these disputes was Baṣrah. The severity of the Khawārij in their opposition to ʿAlī and his descendants caused the partisans of ʿAlī to be extremists in their support for ʿAlī and his family at Kūfah; and later on gave a chance to the Shīʿīs to claim Divine authority for ʿAlī and his sons. This quickly became a matter of dogmatic dispute and a cause of theological opposition over against the Medinese and Syrians too; and Irāq became the centre of

1. See, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, v.3, p.82, Al-Ṭaḥāwī, Mushkal al- Āthār, (Abū al-Maḥāsin Yūsuf b.Mūsā, Al-Muʿtaṣar, p.221), al-Ḥākim, Al-Mustadrak, v.3, p.122, ʿAlī al-Muttaqī, Kanz al-ʿUmmāl, v.6, p.155. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.5, p.12, Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, Tahdhīb al-aḥkām,v.1, p.250, v.2, p.46, Furāt b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī (the third century A.H.), Tafsīr, p.71, ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, Tafsīr, v.2, p.338, Abū Manṣūr Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Ṭabarsī, Al-Iḥtijāj, v.1, p.229, Al-Irbīlī, op.cit., v.1, p.336.

2. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.1, p.103.

all these dogmatic disputes.[1]

In most of their doctrines, apart from faithful submission and sincere attachment to ʿAlī and his descendants, the Shīʿīs were either influenced by the Muʿtazilīs or else they arrived at some similar conclusions. Wāṣil b. ʿAṭā al-Muʿtazilī was a distinct defender of ʿadl (the doctrine whereby God's justice could not be allowed to have imposed upon human beings any pre-destined decree) and we see that the Shīʿīs also held ʿadl as one of their principal doctrines[2] equivalent to tawḥīd (Oneness of God) although they do differ in some of their details.

The Orthodox scholars looked towards the Book and the Sunnah in dogmatics as in other fields of Religion; but the Muʿtazilīs and the Shīʿīs tended rather to support their doctrines by means of reason. On this basis the Shīʿīs'

1. With regard to the homes of the founders and defenders of Muʿtazilī doctrines such as Wāṣil b. ʿAṭā (80-131 A.H.), ʿAmr b. ʿUbayd (144 A.H.), al-Naẓẓām (231 A.H.), Abū al-Hudhayl (235 A.H.), al-Jāḥiẓ (256 A.H.), al-Khayyāṭ (291 A.H.), most of them were in Iraq. Maʿbad al-Juhanī (80 A.H.), the contemporary of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī who is stated to be the first Muslim believer in Free Will also belonged to Baṣrah (Muslim, Al-Sahih, v.1, p.28). He was killed (by al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf); al-ʿAsqalānī Tahdhīb, v.10, p.226; Ghaylān (126 A.H.) was his disciple who transmitted these views to Syria. ʿAmr b. Qays al-Māṣir, the chief of the Murjiʾah, also belonged to Iraq. Jahm b. Ṣafwān (130 A.H.), the chief of the Jahmīyah also belonged to this territory. This state of affairs throws light on why Abū Ḥanīfah, the Sunnī Imām (150 A.H.) valued dogmatic discussions and worked for the Sunnī creed in Fiqh al-Akbar. He represents the Irāqī school of Sunnīs; and his seat of learning and education was Kūfah. Al-Kulaynī had also taken abode in Iraq and resided at Kūfah. Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) establishes Kūfah as 'the House of the scholars (Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, v.1, p.185).

2. See, al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.327.

argumentation appears more rationalistic when compared with that of the men of traditions.[1]

iv. The Spread of forgeries and the two-fold image of ʿAlī.

Except for the Khawārij, all others, Sunnīs and Shīʿīs claim their sincere attachment to ʿAlī. According to the Sunnīs forgeries were composed at this stage in the name of ʿAlī and this went to such an extent that any precise knowledge of ʿAlī's sayings and findings became doubtful. The Shīʿīs laid down their own lines to trace these sayings and findings back to ʿAlī and explained away those traditions of ʿAlī which were found consistent with the Sunnīs as being based on taqīyah (the pious concealment).

Al-Bukhārī holds a contrary view and reports Muḥammad b. Sīrīn (110 A.H.) as expressing:

> The reports traced back to ʿAlī are generally forgeries.[2]

According to the Sunnī traditionists the innovations misrepresented ʿAlī to the extent that only those traditions of ʿAlī were accepted as preserved and authentic which attained the attestation of the pupils of ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd (32 A.H.),[3] the scholars of the first Kūfī school of learning and science. Abū Isḥāq al-Sabīʿī (34-129 A.H.) says:

> When they (the innovators) invented these things after ʿAlī, one Companion of ʿAlī said that God would punish them for the precious knowledge they had wasted.[4]

The Companions of the Imāms mixed the reports of the Shīʿī transmitters and the Sunnī transmitters in such a way that according to the Sunnīs it caused doubts in almost all the Shīʿī transmission. Faḍl b. Shadhān who transmits the traditions from al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām (203 A.H.) and

1. Al-Bukhārī starts his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ with 'the beginning of waḥy (revelation) to the Prophet', whereas al-Kulaynī starts his voluminous work with Kitāb al-ʿaql wa al-jahl.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.5, p.24.
3. Muslim, op.cit., v.1, p.11.
4. ibid.

al-Jawwād, the Ninth Imām (220 A.H.), states:

> I have seen with many of our Companions that they acquired knowledge from the ʿĀmmah (the Sunnīs) and the Khāṣṣah (the Shīʿīs) and they mixed the two; they transmitted the traditions of the ʿĀmmah (as) from the Khāṣṣah and the traditions of the Khāṣṣah (as) from the ʿĀmmah. I dislike facing this mixing and trampling.[1]

Beside the Shīʿī transmitters, some of the orthodox scholars also attended the meetings of the Imāms and transmitted their traditions. Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī (1110 A.H.) writes:

> It is apparent from the traditions that a section of the transmitters who were contemporary with the Shīʿī Imāms did not believe in the Sinless (Divine) status of the Imāms; instead they regarded them as pious scholars and the Rijāl of al-Kashshī bears testimony to this. In spite of this the Imāms recognised their good faith and recognised their trustworthiness as transmitters.[2]

In spite of this close association with the Imāms the Sunnī scholars, as stressed by Muslim, did not admit the reports made by the Shīʿī transmitters as authentic although they hold the Imāms in high esteem and admit their authority and authenticity. It is true that the Shīʿī scholars of ḥadith admit the traditions reported by the non-Imāmī trustworthy transmitters as authentic and name them as al-Qawī, but the point relates to the traditions recorded in the Shīʿī works. As regards the Sunnī works of ḥadith the Shīʿīs do not admit them as authentic and do not recognise ʿAlī's traditions reported by the Sunnī traditionists as true.

v. The two separate schools of knowledge and learning.

The two-fold image of ʿAlī laid the foundation stone of two separate schools of knowledge and learning, both of which admitted ʿAlī as their spiritual guide. He was depicted along two distinct lines; these two lines differed

1. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shūstarī, Majālis al- Muʾminīn, v.1, p.414.
2. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.328.

in their explanation of the Qur'ān and in their approach to the Sunnah, to the extent that the dogmatics as well as the practice of Islām also became matters for dispute.

It is not in our jurisdiction to decide which line rightly goes back to ʿAlī, but we observe that he, in his own time, was not a theologically disputed figure, nor did he rule in a way other than on the lines of his predecessors, the first three Caliphs. The eminent Shīʿī scholar Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shūstarī (1019 A.H.) admits:

> The majority of the people of that time held the view that the Imāmah of ʿAlī was based on the Imāmah of them (the first three Caliphs) and they believed that if their Imāmah were not rightful it would suggest that his (ʿAlī's) Imāmah was also not rightful.[1]

ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, himself admitted in one of his letters that his title to the Caliphate was based on the recognition of those people who had already recognised the first three Caliphs and he was admitted as Caliph on the same conditions on the basis of which the first three Caliphs were admitted.[2] ʿAlī did not found any separate sect nor did he depart from the generality of the orthodox Muslims. Abū Manṣūr Aḥmad al-Ṭabarsī (of the early sixth century A.H.) reports ʿAlī as saying:

> Those who are ahl al-Sunnah take hold of God's commands and the adopted ways of the Prophet.[3]

Al-Kulaynī also corroborates this position of ʿAlī but explains it as being an apology for not having power to reject the adopted ways of the early Caliphs and as having evidence that he led his life under the garb of taqīyah (pious concealment and fearful dissimulation.) Al-Kulaynī reports ʿAlī as saying to those people in his confidence:

> Verily my predecessors have done deeds in which they opposed the Prophet, and they did so intentionally, breaking his agreement and changing his adopted way; and if I urge the people to give

1. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shūstarī, op.cit., v.1, p.54.
2. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.3, p.8.
3. Al-Ṭabarsī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī, op.cit., v.1, p.246.

> them up and turn those things to their (right) places where they were in the life-time of the Prophet my forces will certainly part from me so that I shall be left alone or with some (few) of my people who know my superiority and recognise my (Divine) Imāmah in accordance with the Book of God and the Sunnah of the Prophet of God.[1]

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh corroborates the same explanation for ʿAlī's not discarding the adopted lines of the early Caliphs.[2] These reports indicate that up to that time there were apparently not two ideological or theological schools. However, these reports also suggest that veiled criticism of the early Caliphs had already started and that the theory of ʿAlī's Divine Imāmah had already been introduced, even though this may have been done secretly.

Al-Bukhārī does not admit such reports as rightly traced back to ʿAlī, and holds such reports as were attributed to ʿAlī as utterly false.[3] He supports the open and public position of ʿAlī and confirms his open claim to be the fourth of the Orthodox Caliphs. The apparently two-fold position of ʿAlī put the scholars of ḥadīth in a very critical position as to how they should differentiate the open and public claim of ʿAlī from the secret and hidden position of the Imām. Al-Taqī al-Majlisī (1070 A.H.) states:

> As the tyrant rulers of that age were dominant, the Divine Imāms concealed their actions from the general public; but their companions, whose number was unlimited, knew their instructions and they knew which of their actions were connected with fearful dissimulation. Thus their time passed by till the Greater Occultation of the Divine Imām occurred.... There was no way to find which tradition was based on taqīyah and which on faith.... The differences among the Shīʿīs broke out.[4]

The Sunnīs do not believe in taqīyah and regard ʿAlī as above such fearful dissimulation; and it remains broadly true that in the very beginning there were only political disputes between the partisans of ʿAlī and his opponents,

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.51.
2. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh, op.cit., v.1, p.54.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.5, p.24.
4. Al-Taqī al-Majlisī, Sharḥ al-Faqīh, v.1, p.16.

but these ultimately developed into theological differences. Within this process certain heretical intruders of Jewish and Zoroastrian origin formulated some further dogmatic variations.

4. The intrusion of foreign wisdom.

i. The intrusion of the Jews.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabāʾ is reported to have been the first to introduce the issue of the Divine position of ʿAlī. He produced theoretical disputes in the divergent circles of Islām and introduced his ex-Jewish conceptions in the Muslim political field. The eminent Shīʿī scholar Abū ʿAmr al-Kashshī[1] (died about 370 A.H.) comments:

> Verily ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabāʾ was a Jew; then he turned Muslim and claimed ʿAlī's friendship. When he was a Jew he had formed an exaggerated opinion regarding Yūshaʿ (b. Nūn) the heir of Mūsā. So when he embraced Islām after the Prophet's death he asserted the same opinion in respect of ʿAlī; he was the first who proclaimed the Divine Imāmah of ʿAlī. On this ground the opponents of the Shīʿīs say that the origin of the Shiʿīs is from Judaism.[2]

The Sunnī scholar Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī al-Baghdādī (429 A.H.) mentions ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabāʾ among those who claimed for Alī the conception of God-man and he states that they are named as Sabāʾīyah; and he (al-Tamīmī) reckons them among those who transgressed the essentials of their religion and formed exaggerated opinions. He states that this Shīʿī sect is the seventh of these transgressors.[3]

One may deny that ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabāʾ was an historical figure on the presumption that he has not been mentioned in the books earlier than the Rijāl of al-Kashshī. Al-Kashshī lived in the fourth century but we find ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabāʾ

1. Kashsh is a village of Jurjān; it is fathah on kāf (Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqir al-Khwānsārī, Rawḍāt al-Jannāt, p.530)
2. Al-Kashshī, Rijāl, pp.101.
3. Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir, Uṣūl al-Dīn, p.332.

mentioned[1] in the third century by Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī, the eminent Shīʿī scholar[2] of ḥadith and biographies.

The Jews up to the time of al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, (114 A.H.), are found to have been stating the Shīʿī doctrine of ʿAlī's right to the Prophet's succession and to have been seen giving their consent to embracing Islām on the basis of that very issue. Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (381 A.H.) reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> The chief of the Jews came to ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, when he returned from the battle of Al-Nahrawān and was sitting in the Mosque of Kūfah. The Jew said, 'O Commander of the Faithful! I want to ask you some questions which are not known except to the Prophet or to the heir of the Prophet. (If you like I shall ask you, otherwise I shall let it pass.') ʿAlī said, 'O brother of the Jews! Ask what you want.' He said that they found in the Tawrah (the Old Testament) that whenever God sent any Prophet He commanded him (the Prophet) to nominate anyone from his family as his successor and ordered his people to obey him and asked him to act upon that after him.[3]

ʿAlī is then reported to have stated all his differences and disputes with the others and called him (the Jew) to join him (ʿAlī) if his answers were consistent with his (the Jew's) criterion. The Jew gave his consent to join ʿAlī on that very ground.

ii. The intrusion of the Zoroastrians.

Sīsawayh, the Zoroastrian, is reported to be the first to have discussed free will in Irāq. Maʿbad al-Juhanī was his disciple who rejected pre-destination at Baṣrah. Ghaylān is said to be the third in this sequence. Muslim (261 A.H.) reports Yaḥyā b. Yaʿmar (89 A.H.) as saying:

1. Al-Nawbakhtī, Firaq al-Shīʿah, p.22. Al-Māmaqānī also refers to him (See, Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl, v.1, p.212).
2. See, al-Najjāshī, Rījāl, p.46, Qāḍī Nūr Allāh, op.cit., v.1, p.426.
3. Ibn Bābawayh, op.cit., v.2, p.14. The line in the brackets occurs only in the new edition. (See, v.2, p.123.)

> The first man who criticised pre-destination at Baṣrah was Maʿbad al-Juhanī. So when I and Ḥumayd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥimyarī proceeded as pilgrims we resolved that if we met anyone of the Companions of the Prophet we should ask him what they said in respect of pre-destination; we were given a chance to see ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar inside the Mosque; we went to him, one of us from his right hand and the other from his left. I thought that my fellow would entrust the conversation to me. So I said that there appeared among us some people who recited the Qurʾān and were deeply versed in knowledge and their status was recognised; and they had said that there was no pre-destination and that men's affairs were freshly created. He answered that when we met them we should warn them that he (ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar) was immune from them and that they were apart from him.[1]

This report suggests that in the late period of the Companions some dogmatic issues had emerged and the Companions, who were living at that time, had quite clearly rejected these innovations; and they did not allow any sort of intrusion into the Islāmic Faith.

Al-Awzāʿī, the Imām (157 A.H.), comments upon the intrusion of the heresy as follows:

> The first man who spoke against pre-destination was Sūsan from Iraq. He was a Christian and he embraced Islām, but he again turned Christian. Maʿbad (80 A.H.) was his pupil, and Ghaylān (126 A.H.) was the pupil of Maʿbad.[2]

Ibn Taymīyah (728 A.H.) says that his name was Sīsāwayh and he was from among the Zoroastrians.

> The first man who innovated it (the doctrine of free will) in Irāq was a resident of Baṣrah named Sīsawayh from among the Zoroastrians; then Maʿbad al-Juhanī (80 A.H.), and Ghaylān (126 A.H.) acquired this doctrine from him.[3]

Iraqians were the neighbours of Persians and could easily be influenced by them. The Zoroastrians believed in dualism and

1. Muslim, op.cit., v.1, p.28.
2. Al-ʿAsqalānī, op.cit., v.10, p.226.
3. Shabbīr Aḥmad al-ʿUthmānī, Fatḥ al-Mulhim, v.1, p.160.

considered Yazdān and Ahriman as the two independent Creators of 'good' and 'evil' respectively. This doctrine influenced certain Muslims and there appeared a sect known as the Qadarīyah who did not believe in pre-destination. Al-Khaṭṭābī (388 A.H.) says that as the Zoroastrians believe in two Independent Powers, the Light and the Darkness, the Qadarīyah also establish the human beings as the creators of their deeds and actions.[1] ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion (73 A.H.) reports the Prophet as predicting:

> The Qadarīyah are the Magians of this (Muslim) community.[2]

Ḥudhayfah, the Companion (35 A.H.), also reports the Prophet as saying:

> The Magians of the Ummah are those who do not believe in pre-destination.[3]

These traditions show how contemporary thought influenced the Muslim. Christian thought and Greek philosophy were also living forces. The Christian Church was split up into various divisions. The Monophysite and Nestorian Churches existed in Sāsānī Persia rather than the alien orthodox state-church of Byzantine. Those Muslims who were inclined to harmonise any parallel systems of thought counselled allegorical interpretation of some of the questions at issue. The political disputes gave refuge to these doctrinal differences resulting in the development of various Muslim dogmatics. Irāq was at that time the centre of political variations. De Boer says:

> Generally speaking it was at Baṣrah that the influence of philosophic doctrines first appeared and among its grammarians were to be found many Shīʿīs and Muʿtazilites, who readily permitted foreign wisdom to influence their doctrinal teaching.[4]

1. Al-Khaṭṭabī, op.cit., v.4, p.317.
2. Abū Dāʾūd, Al-Sunan, v.2, p.644. (See a similar tradition, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.22).
3. Abū Dāʾūd, op.cit., v.2, p.644.
4. J. De Boer, The History of Philosophy in Islām, p.33.

As regards attachment to the Family of the Prophet the Shīʿīs and Muʿtazilīs are different from each other, but in most of their doctrines they arrive at similar results. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh says that the Orthodox Muslims do consider the Shīʿīs and the Muʿtazilīs as being one.[1]

iii. The influence of Christian thought.

We agree with Elder that the Christian parallel streams of thought influenced to some extent the Muslim circles of dogmatics. Elder says:

> The close resemblance between material that appears in the writings of John of Damascus and the Murjiʾites' and the Qadarites' doctrines is proof of this. The Khārijite doctrine that those who were guilty of great sins were no longer to be considered as true believers is essentially that of Christians who classify sins as mortal and venial.[2]

As regards the Muʿtazilah he further states:

> Undoubtedly in reaching their position the Muʿtazilites were greatly influenced by Christian thought and Greek philosophy.[3]

The close resemblance between these two lines, Christian dogmatics and Muslim dogmatics, does not necessarily mean that one has been imported from the other; but it does suggest that both have come down from one main source and that is God's revelation. According to the Muslim Faith the two religions, Islām and Christianity, have come down from one source. It is true that just as the Christians were split up into various divisions, the Muslims also fell into theological disputes; those of them who were inclined to rationalise their religious tenets were certainly influenced by parallel streams of thought. It is more plausible to interpret this as an indirect relationship rather than as a direct connection. De Boer does not claim

1. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh, op.cit., v.1, p.426. The Muʿtazilī element, after its downfall was absorbed into Shīʿīsm. (See, A.J. Arberry, The Legacy of Persia, p.157.)
2. E.E. Elder, op.cit., p.11.
3. ibid, p.14.

that the men of traditions were influenced by Christian thought; instead he avers that it was the men of reason who bear close resemblance to some of the Christian thinkers and he provides evidence that these two lines are directly connected.

5. The doctrine of the Divine authority of the rulers.

i. The political aspect of the Shīʿī phenomenon.

The Shīʿī doctrine of the Divine authority of ʿAlī, which is said to have been brought forth by the ex-Jew ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabāʾ, found ample support in their neighbours' parallel streams of thought. The Zoroastrians of Iran believed in the Divine Right of the Sāsānī Kings, and this conception of sovereignty led the neighbouring Muslims of Kūfah, and later on certain Muslims of Persian origin, to believe in the Divine Imāmah of ʿAlī. It is true that the majority of the Muslim community in Irāq and Irān did not adopt the Shīʿī doctrines at that time,[1] but as compared with the other zones of Muslim territory this zone was mostly influenced by the Zoroastrian conception of sovereignty. Gobineau states:

> C'est un point de doctrine politique incontestе en Perse que les Alides seuls ont le droit à porter légitimement la couronne, et cela en leur double qualité d'héritiers des sasanides, par leur mère, Bibi-Sheher-banou, fille du dernier roi Yazdedjerd, et d'Imāms, chefs de la religion vraie.[2]

It is a controversial point whether Shehr Banou was a historical figure to represent the Royal Family of the Sāsānīs or not, but there is no dispute that the Shīʿīs admitted the same doctrine of the 'Divine Right of Kings' in respect of the Family of the Prophet which the Persians had held in respect of the House of Sāsān. This is corroborated by the fact that almost all the Shīʿī traditionists and jurists of the early times come out of Irāq and Irān. Browne comments:

1. See, Saʿīd Nafīsī, Muqaddimah Nathr Fārsī Muʿāṣir, p.12.
2. Gobineau, Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asia Centrale, p.275. (Quoted by E.G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, v.1, p.130).

> For myself, I believe that Gobineau is right in asserting that this doctrine of the Divine Right of the House of Sásán has had an immense influence on all subsequent Persian history, more especially on the tenacity with which the Persians have clung to the doctrine of the Shīʿa or sect of ʿAlī.[1]

He further states:

> From the earliest times the idea of Divine Right has strongly possessed the Persians, while the idea of popular and democratic election, natural to the Arabs, has always been extremely distasteful to them. It was natural therefore that from the first the Persians should have formed the backbone of the Shīʿa party and their allegiance to the fourth Imām ʿAlī and his descendants was undoubtedly strengthened by the belief that his mother was a princess[2] of the old Royal House of Sásán.[3]

We find support for this idea, concerning the Persian influence on Shīʿīsm, in Wickens' statement:

> That Shīʿīsm in its religious implications is a Persian phenomenon seems so obvious a fact that no one is likely to be misled by the emphasis placed on the Arab origin of many of the earliest adherents of the ʿAlid faction by those whose chief concern is political history. Shīʿīsm, in its most important religious aspect, attempted to supply Islam in the spirit of the ancient light-cults with that infallible actual authority which is sought by all religions in some form or other.[4]

It is true that up to the time of the Fourth Imām ʿAlī Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn (95 A.H.) the Shīʿīs had not developed as an ideological and a religious sect, but there are grounds to suggest that ʿAlī, the First Imām and his two sons, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, after their deaths were depicted on two different lines; the open and the public; and the secret and the hidden which was based on taqīyah, pious concealment; their names were differently used by the revolutionary groups. Hitti says:

1. E.G. Browne, op.cit., v.1, p.130. Cf., v.1, p.391, v.4, p.403.
2. Al-Kulaynī mentions her name as Salāmāh (op.cit., v.1, p.466).
3. E.G. Browne, op.cit., v.2, p.194.
4. A.J. Arberry, op.cit., p.153.

> To his Shīʿīte partisans - ʿAlī dead proved more effective than ʿAlī living.[1]

He further states:

> The blood of al-Ḥusayn, even more than that of his father proved to be the seed of the Shīʿīte church.[2]

The Shīʿīs provided a field from which various revolutions and innovations emerged, as Wickens remarks:

> In company with the Ṣūfīs and the Fatalists, the Shīʿītes held open, into the outwardly forbidding fortress of Islām, a door of hospitality through which all men could pass and repass.[3]

As regards the element of mystical interpretation which the Shīʿīs provided for Islām, Nicholson writes:

> So without ceasing to be Moslems in name, the Shīʿītes transmuted Islām into whatever shape they pleased by virtue of a mystical interpretation based on the infallible authority of the house of Muhammad and out of the ruins of a political party there gradually arose a great religious organisation in which men of the most diverse opinions could work together for deliverance from the Umayyad Yoke.[4]

We agree that when celebrity, which in the early days had been used to cover the transmission defects, was lost, the provision of a mystical interpretation and the presumption of <u>taqīyah</u> (pious concealment and fearful dissimulation) everywhere[5] encouraged innovators to transmute Islām into whatever shape men liked; but we do not admit that all this presentation and interpretation was made with impious intentions nor do we believe

1. Hitti, <u>The History of the Arabs</u>, p.182.
2. <u>ibid</u>, p.191.
3. A.J. Arberry, <u>op.cit</u>., p.157.
4. Nicholson, <u>A Literary History of Arabs</u>, p.220. Hitti corroborates this: 'The Shīʿah soil proved most fertile for the development of heterodoxies'. <u>op.cit</u>., p.441.
5. Al-Taqī al-Majlisī (1070 A.H.) narrates this state of affairs: On account of the domination of the rulers of oppression, their books were burnt and most of them plunged into water. As for the books which remained safe, most of their traditions fell short of celebrity....There was no way out to find which tradition was based on <u>taqīyah</u> and which on faith. (Al-Taqī al-Majlisī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.16.)

that no sincere effort prevailed to defend the faith and revive the true aspects of religion. In spite of the interruption in celebrity of transmission of the Imāms' instructions there had been scholars who very scrupulously defended the Imāmī faith and purified the true from the false. The bona fides of the academic aspects of the Shīʿī Faith is secure.

ii. The development of the academic aspects of the Shīʿī Faith.

The political aspect of the Shīʿī phenomenon had been dominating so long as the Umayyads had been in power but at the downfall of the Umayyad Government and the formation of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate the Shīʿīs appeared as a religious party, even though the newly arisen variations of the descendants of ʿAlī and the Family of ʿAbbās did not give them full liberty to develop until Maʾmūn the Caliph; it was in his time that the Shīʿīs appeared in their fully developed form. Their scholars did their best to approach the right path of the Divine Imāms and record and revive the spiritual aspects of their teachings.

It is a fact that there were political disputes at the first stage which developed into ideological differences, sometimes under the influence of alien or parallel streams of contemporary thought. These events caused them to have different motivations and methods which they traced back to the Prophet and his Family. They interpreted the Qurʾān itself differently and introduced a new conception of taʾwīl in this context. As regards the scrutiny of the traditions they turned towards them very late.[1]

1. Al-Taqī al-Majlisī (1070 A.H.) states that when celebrity of the Imāms' instructions was lost and the differences among the Shīʿīs broke out the scholars of the eleventh century A.H. revived the faith and scrutinised the reports. He describes the state of this revival: 'Thirty years ago the profound scholar Muḥammad Amīn Astarābādī (1041 A.H.) busied himself with the traditions of the Imāms and most of the people of Najaf and the sublime monasteries appreciated his efforts and turned towards the traditions. It is a fact that most of his findings are correct.' (ibid, v.1, p.16.)

iii. The Orthodox explanation of the Qur'ān.

The Orthodox Muslims explained the Qur'ān in the light of the open and public life of the Prophet, his Companions and his Family, whereas the Shī'īs, as we observed in Nicholson's statement, provided some mystical, allegorical and interior interpretations for the Qur'ān.

However, we give here the comparative study of both the lines, in respect of the fundamental doctrines of Islām, and we shall observe that, in spite of a continuous series of variations, they are at one in regard to the basic conception of Islām.

The first of these doctrines deals with the Names and Attributes of God.

Chapter II. THE NAMES OF GOD AND HIS ATTRIBUTES.

All Muslims believe in the Oneness of God, and it is also established that He is Eternal and Necessarily Existent. The One God has numerous Names and various expressions. According to the Qur'ān God is Knowing, Living, Powerful, Hearing, Seeing, Willing, Desiring, Creating and Sustaining. The Attributes of God are from all eternity subsistent in His Person although this is not explicitly stated in the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān gives the idea of God's Oneness, His Attributes and His Qualities without indulging in logical terms and dogmatic discussions. It gives the Name al-Awwal rather than al-Qadīm; al-Qayyūm instead of al-Wājih; and al-Khāliq instead of al-Ṣāniʿ. These words are found in the later dogmatic discussions, but the Qur'ān does not mention the words Dhāt (Essence) and Ṣifāt (Attributes).[1]

1. The Names of God.

The Qur'ān says:

> And God's are the most Excellent Names, so call on Him thereby and leave them alone who violate the sanctity of His Names.[2]
>
> Say: call on God or call on the Beneficent, by whatever (name) you call on Him, He has the most Excellent Names.[3]
>
> There is no God but He, He has the most Excellent Names.[4]

1. The usual English translation of Ṣifāt by 'attributes' may give rise to some confusion unless it is strictly used in its proper meaning of 'essential characteristics.' One notes in particular that the verbal form of 'attributing to' suggests an additional quality which dangerously compromises the basic meaning. The same is the case with the Arabic word Ṣifah which resulted in dispute whether the Ṣifāt are subsistent in His Being, or whether they are other than He. This will be discussed in detail later on. Meanwhile the word 'attributes' will be used here in its general meaning for Ṣifāt without favouring one side or other of the Sunnī and Shīʿī disputes in this respect. This is part of the inescapable tension of trying to use created words to depict the Creator.
2. S 7:180.
3. S 17:110.
4. S 20:8.

> He is God besides whom there is no one to be worshipped; the Knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is God besides whom there is no one to be worshipped; the King, the Holy, the Author of peace, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of every greatness. Glory to God! He is above any partners. He is God, the Creator, the Evolver, the Bestower of Forms. His are the most Excellent Names; whatever is in the heavens and the earth declares His Glory; and He is the Mighty, the Wise.[1]

The Qur'ān does not number the Names, nor claims to have mentioned them all; but the Prophet described these Names explicitly.

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī and the Sunnī traditionists.

Al-Bukhārī reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet as follows:

> Verily there are the ninety-nine Names of God, a hundred but one; whoever has learned those (by heart) will enter Paradise.[2]

Al-Bukhārī (256 A.H.) and Muslim (261 A.H.) have not given the list of those Names but al-Tirmīdhī (279 A.H.), al-Bayhaqī (458 A.H.), Ibn Ḥibbān (354 A.H.) and al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī (405 A.H.) have listed them. Al-Dāraquṭnī (385 A.H.) reports 'the traditions giving these ninety-nine names' as having come down from God (Ḥadīth Qudsī).[3]

God's Names are not limited to this number. The ninety-nine Names have been mentioned so as to suggest that the learning of them by heart and the remembrance of them in the mind ensures one's entry to Paradise. Apart from them, there are numerous other names. ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion (32 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

1. S 59:22-4.
2. Al-Bukhārī, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, v.9, p.145. Al-Kulaynī the Chief Shīʿī traditionist (328 A.H.) also corroborates this number of Names, (Al-Kāfī, v.1, p.87, 114).
3. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Fatḥ al-Bārī, v.11, p.180.

> One who is overcome by any anxiety or grief should call, 'O God! I am Your servant and the son of Your servant and the son of Your handmaid (She-servant); I am in Your grip; my forelock is in Your Hand; Your determination regarding me is effective; Your decision for me is enforced. I beg by means of every Name of Yours, by which You have called Yourself whether You revealed that Name in Your Book, or told that Name to one of Your creatures, or preferred to keep that Name in Your secret knowledge; may you make the Qur'ān the Spring of my heart and the light of my soul and the means of clearing away my anxiety and my grief'.[1]

Razīn (died after 520 A.H.) reports that the Prophet declared:

> No one had ever spoken this (the above-given prayer) without God's removing his grief and giving him joy instead of it.[2]

Al-Bayhaqī (458 A.H.) further reports ʿĀishah (57 A.H.), the Mother of the Faithful, as calling on God as follows; and the Prophet approved that prayer of hers:

> O God I beg from You by means of all Your most Excellent Names, by those which we know and by those which we did not know.[3]

These reports bear evidence that God's Names are not limited to the ninety-nine Names. Al-Bayhaqī has given the following Chapter-heading to these traditions:

> The description that God has some other Names also and that there is no rebuttal of others in the Prophet's statement that God has ninety-nine names. Verily they (the ninety-nine) are particularly mentioned as they are mostly well-known and recognised in their implications.

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) also supports this view-point and reports the agreement of the scholars upon it:

1. Al-Bayhaqī, Kitāb al-Asmā' wa al-Ṣifāt, pp.4-5.
2. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, Mishkāt, p.216. Al-Kulaynī also reports this supplication but there is a slight difference of words. Saʿīd b. Yasār told Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, that he was afflicted by much anxiety and the Imām instructed him to pray so. (Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.562).
3. Al-Bayhaqī, op.cit., p.5.

> All the scholars agree that this tradition (mentioning ninety-nine Names) does not limit God's names. It does not mean that He has no other names than these.[1]

Al-ʿAsqalānī states that most of these Names are Ṣifāt (Attributes) and His Attributes are not limited.[2] The list of Names given by al-Tirmīdhī (277 A.H.) does not cover all His Names given in the Qurʾān but besides them there are some others.[3] There are also some further names mentioned by the Prophet.[4] The list given by Ibn Mājah (273 A.H.) does not tally with the list of al-Tirmīdhī. Al-Tirmīdhī (279 A.H.) states his report to be gharīb and says:

> We do not know the mention of Names in most of the true reports except in this one.[5]

Ibn Ḥazm (456 A.H.) comments upon the chain of the transmitters as follows:

> The traditions mentioning the Names are weak; no such tradition is found to be Ṣaḥiḥ. All the Names which I found in the Qurʾān are sixty-eight.[6]

1. Al-Nawawī, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, v.2, p.342.
2. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, op.cit., v.11, p.187.
3. Al-Mawlā, Al-Naṣīr (S :78), Ghālib (S 12:21), Qāhir (S 6:61), Qarīb (S 2:186), Al-Rabb(S 34:15). There are twenty-seven Names which are found in the Qurʾān but not given in the report of al-Tirmidhī. (See, Al-ʿAsqalānī, op.cit., v.11, p.184).
4. Al-Witr (al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.109), Al-Tāmm, Al-Qadīm, Al-Witr, (Ibn Mājah, Al-Sunan, v.2, p.229), Al-Ḥannān, Al-Mannān (al-Bayhaqī, op.cit., p.64, Al-Ṭalib (ibid, p.67), Al-Burhān, (Ibn Mājah, op.cit., v.2, p.228).
5. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.265. The transmitter Walīd b. Muslim has been reported to be mudallis, one who conceals the name of his direct teacher.
6. See, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, op.cit., v.11, p.183; he suggests why al-Bukhārī has not listed these Names.

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī and the Shīʿī traditionists.

Al-Kulaynī, the Chief Shīʿī traditionist (328 A.H.) reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as stating that God has many Names.[1] Al-Kulaynī also admits that all the Names have not been revealed or told to His creatures.[2] He reports, in one context, that He has Ninety-nine Names[3] but he has not given the list of these Names; he gives various series of the Names in different contexts. He gives a list of thirty-three Names in one context[4] and mentions thirty-six Names in another context[5] with some addition and some omission in comparison to the first list. He reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> In the afternoon of the second thulth (one third) of the month of Ramaḍān take the Qurʾān in your hand, open it and place it before you and say; 'O God! I beg you, by the means of Your revealed Book and what is therein; and there is your Greatest and most Magnificent Name; and there are Your most Excellent Names and there is what is to be feared and what is to be aspired to; may You establish me among those who are reprieved from hell;' and (then) ask Him to provide you what you need.[6]

This report suggests that the most Excellent Names are in the Qurʾān; but it is also a fact that all the Names given in the Qurʾān do not exceed the number of sixty-eight. This explains why al-Kulaynī, where he mentions the Names to be ninety-nine, does not mention them as Al-Asmāʾ al-Ḥusnā (the most Excellent Names). According to him the Names given in the Qurʾān are the most Excellent Names. The learning of the Ninety-nine Names by heart is a means to ensure one's entry to Paradise; otherwise His names are not limited to the Ninety-nine. In one context al-Kulaynī mentions the

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.485.
2. ibid., v.2, p.562.
3. ibid., v.1, pp.87, 114.
4. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.516.
5. ibid, v.2, pp.583-4.
6. ibid., v.2, p.629.

number of His names as being three-hundred and sixty including the most Excellent Names;[1] and this is a point upon which al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī agree, namely that the Names of God are not limited to any specific number.

Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (381 A.H.) reports ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as transmitting from the Prophet that God has Ninety-nine Names, remembrance of which in the mind ensures one's entry to Paradise. Al-Ṣuddūq then gives the list of these Ninety-nine Names.[2]

2. The relation between the Names and the One Who is named.

Having agreed on the basic point that God has Names the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs differ as to whether the Names of God possess the sources from which those Names are derived or as to whether His Names do not possess these sources. Al-Bukhārī supports the former view-point, whereas al-Kulaynī favours the latter.

i. Al-Bukhārī's explanation of the sources of the Names of God.

We have already observed in the first chapter that the dogmatic disputes arose long after the time of the Companions and that they developed gradually. Al-Bukhārī (256 A.H.) worked in the first half of the third century of the hijrah. The doctrinal disputes were in full spate at that time although they had not been systematically formulated in those days.

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (324 A.H.) is generally considered as the first to formulate the doctrinal position of Orthodox Islām and to face the heterodox opinions. Al-Kulaynī (328 A.H.) was a contemporary of al- Ashʿarī (324 A.H.)

1. ibid, v.1, p.112.
2. Al-Ṣuddūq, Kitāb al-Khiṣāl, v.2, p.156.

and he had already come across the Sunnī approach on the questions at issue.

Before we discuss al-Bukhārī's opinion it is appropriate to state what position al-Bukhārī holds in the Orthodox circles of doctrine. He belongs to the circle of traditionists who were not reconciled with the mutakallimūn, the Scholastic theologians. In spite of this the traditionists faced heterodox opinions and refuted them in their own way.[1] This is more clearly observable in the later development of different Sunnī dogmatics.[2] Nawwāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan of Bhopal (about 1301 A.H.) gives a comprehensive statement on this point:

> As in the applications of observance of the religion there developed four schools: the Ḥanafīyah, Mālikīyah, Shāfiʿīyah and Ḥanābilah: there also developed three schools of Dogmatics, Ḥanābilah, Maturīdīyah and Ashʿarīyah. The Ḥanābilah relate to the Great Imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal[3] and most of the people of tradition and Ẓāhirīyah agree with them. The Māturīdīyah are related to Abū Manṣur who is linked with Imām Aʿzam Abū Ḥanīfah by three links. Māturīd is a village of Samarqand and this Imām belonged to that village. The people of Transoxania and most of the Ḥanafīyah follow him in dogmatics. The Ashʿarīs are related to Abū al-Ḥasan al-Aṣhʿarī who by ten links was the grandson of Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī (the Companion 52 A.H.). The people of Khurasan, Irāq, etc. agree with him and the Mālikīyah and Shāfiʿīyah also follow him in dogmatics. The differences between the Maturīdīyah

1. It is true that the introduction of Dialectics into Islām was vehemently denounced by the traditionists but it is also a fact that in the ʿAbbāsī period the traditionists began to build up a system of belief. (See, De Boer, The History of Philosophy in Islām, p.44. Al-Bukhārī (256 A.H.), Abū Dāʾūd (275 A.H.), al-Tirmidhī (279 A.H.), Ibn Mājah (273 A.H.) all laid down Chapter-headings to refute the doctrines of the Jahmīyah.

2. The Sunnī Schools of jurisprudence were already established before the development of different Sunnī Schools of dogmatics. The Ethical system was developed before the Doctrinal. According to al-Ghazālī, 'Fiqh' is the daily bread of believing souls while the Doctrine is only valuable as a medicine for the sick. (De Boer, op.cit., p.39).

3. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal led a reactionary movement that insisted on a literal interpretation of the Qurʾān and abhorred rationalising. With him, dogma had for its real basis the Qurʾān and Traditions that went back to the first generation of Believers. (E.E. Elder, Introduction to Al-Taftazānī's Commentary on the creed of Islam, p.xv).

and the ʿAshʿarīyah do not exceed twelve points and they agree on the others. The Ḥanābilah and the ʿAshʿarīyah also do not differ except on three of four points and they also agree on the others. These differences, among the scholars, are verbal discussions and essentially outward disputes. So the Sunnī is one whose beliefs are reconciled with the beliefs of these eminent scholars.[1]

Al-Bukhārī, the pupil of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal being a traditionist belongs to the first of these three schools; but holding an independent view and being an eminent critic he differed in some points from the traditionists also. The incident[2] in which he encountered Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Dhuhlī (258 A.H.), the teacher of Muslim, bears evidence of this. The traditionists generally believe that even our letters for God's speech should not be declared as created whereas al-Bukhārī holds an independent view. As regards the other doctrines he is with the traditionists. Here we give the explanation of al-Bukhārī in regard to the sources of His Names.

There is a particular book of al-Bukhārī in his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ known as Kitāb al-Tawḥīd in which he refutes the doctrines of the Jahmīyah and the Muʿtazilīs and thereby enters an area of possible disagreement with the Shīʿīs. Al-Bukhārī's Chapter-headings in this book indicate that in spite of being a traditionist and not a mutakallim (Scholastic theologian) he bore in mind all the dogmatic disputes of that time. In particular, he refutes the Muʿtazilīs' and the Shīʿīs' doctrines and differs also with the Ḥanbalīs and with what was to be that of the Ashʿarīs[3] in some of their doctrinal conclusions. So he seems to be facing the three circles. Here we explain his stand as compared to the Muʿtazilīs' and the Shīʿīs' doctrines.

The Muʿtazilīs and the Shīʿīs believed that God has Names but that He does not possess the sources from which

1. Nawwāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān, Bughyat al-Rāʾid, p.4.
2. See, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfʿīyat-al-Kubrā, v.2, p.11.
3. The Ashʿarīs developed at a later stage when Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (324 A.H.) worked out and systematised the Sunnī dogmatics but men of their doctrines already existed at the time of al-Bukhārī.

those Names were derived. They said that God is Knowing but not by knowledge, and that He is Powerful but not by power, Al-Bukhārī says that God possesses all these sources and He implements His Attributes and expresses all these sources in His actions. Al-Bukhārī lays down the following Chapter-heading:[1]

> Say: Call on God or call on the Beneficent; by whatever (Name) you call on Him He has the most Excellent Names.[2]

He, then, expresses his view by mentioning some of His Names and then explaining them by reporting from the Prophet or from the Companions that God possesses the sources from which His Names have been derived and displays them in His actions. He lays down the following sub-headings:-

> i. Surely God is the Bestower of sustenance, the Lord of Power, the Strong.[3]
>
> ii. The Knower of the unseen! So He does not reveal His secrets to any;[4] surely God is He with Whom is the knowledge of the Hour;[5] He has revealed it with His knowledge;[6] and no female bears, nor does she bring forth but with His knowledge;[7] To Him is referred the knowledge of the Hour.[8]

Al-Bukhārī wants to prove that God shows mercy (in so far as He is the Merciful and Beneficent), that He bestows sustenance (in so far as He is the Sustaining), that He possesses Power and that He possesses Knowledge. He rejects the opinion that God is Merciful and Sustaining without possessing the sources of mercy and sustenance; nor is He the Powerful without Power nor the Knowing without knowledge. He reports the Prophet as saying:

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.141.
2. S 17:110.
3. S 51:58.
4. S 72:26.
5. S 31:34.
6. S 4:166.
7. S 35:11.
8. S 41:47.

> There is no one more for,bearing of the annoyance he has heard than God; the people claim that He has a son yet He absolves them and provides them with subsistence, and sustenance.[1]

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion (73 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> The Keys of the unseen are five which are not known to anyone but God; no one knows what the womb encloses, and no one knows what will occur on the next day, but God; and no one knows when it will rain but God; and no one knows where he is to die, and no one knows when it will be the Last Day, but God.[2]

The Prophet is acknowledging here His Knowledge, just as he described Him, in the preceding tradition, as providing them with subsistence.

Al-Bukhārī further lays down the following Chapter-heading:

> And He is Mighty, the Wise;[3] Glory to your Lord, the Lord of Might;[4] To God belongs the Might and to His Apostle;[5] And one who takes an oath by the Might of God and His Attributes;[6] Anas said on the authority of the Prophet that hell will swear by His Might; Abū Hurayrah reports the Prophet as saying that there will be a man between Paradise and hell, the last of the people of hell to enter Paradise, who will say, 'O Lord reverse my face from the fire; by Your Might I shall not ask you any other than that'; Abū Saʿīd reports the Prophet as saying that God will answer, 'It is granted and ten other such (demands)'; Ayyūb reports, 'By Thy Might I am not to dispense with Thy Blessing.'[7]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.141.
2. ibid., v.9, p.142.
3. S 59:1.
4. S 37:180.
5. S 63:8.
6. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.167.
7. ibid., v.9, p.143.

The traditions referred to have been given in the form of ta'līq (that is, not provided with a systematic chain) as they are a part of the Chapter-heading. Then al-Bukhārī transmits the two traditions of the Prophet, one from Ibn 'Abbās (68 A.H.) and the second from Anas (91 A.H.)[1], to prove that the Prophet took refuge in God's Might and required that oaths should be made by His Might.

Al-Bukhārī gives two other Chapter-headings as follows:

> i. And God is the Hearing and the Seeing;[2] and A'mash reports 'Ā'ishah as saying, 'All praise to God Whose hearing is above any voices; God revealed to the Prophet,' Indeed God heard the plea of her who pleads with you about her husband.[3]
>
> ii. Say He is the Powerful.[4]

Al-Bukhārī reports Abū Mūsā, the Companion (52 A.H.), as saying that they were on a journey accompanied by the Prophet and as they ascended they shouted aloud in the Name of God. So the Prophet said:

> Be moderate as you are not calling for one who is deaf or absent; you are calling for One Who is the Hearing, the Seeing and the Near.[5]

Al-Bukhārī suggests by this tradition that His Attribute of being 'The Hearing' has been mentioned here in comparison to being deaf and His being 'The Near' stands here against being absent and it shows that He is the Hearing as compared to the deaf and it suggests that He possesses the sources of hearing which a deaf one lacks. Al-Bukhārī then reports Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh, the Companion, as saying that the Prophet instructed his Companion to pray to God that He would suggest to them the right course in all matters (perhaps through a dream serving as an augury) and he attached an equivalent

1. ibid, v.9, p.143
2. S 42:11; 40:20; 17:1.
3. S 58:1.
4. S 6:65.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.144.

importance to this as he attached to a Surah of the Qur'ān. The Prophet says:

> When anyone of you is anxious about a matter, he should pray two rakʿāt which are not compulsory and then say, 'O God! I ask Your guidance by Your Knowledge, I seek from You power by Your Power and I seek from You Your Bounty, as You have Power and I lack that; and You know and I do not know and You are The Knower of all the unseen. O God! If You know that this matter is good for me regarding my affair in this world and the next or in regard to my faith, my livelihood and my future, then grant it to be my fortune and make it easy for me, and then bless me in it. But if You know that this matter is bad for me regarding my Faith, my livelihood, and my future wellbeing or (he said) in regard to my affairs in this world and the next, then turn me away from it, ordain good for me wherever it is and then make me content with that'.[1]

Al-Bukhārī proves, by this report, that God possesses the sources of His Names and He is The Knower by His Knowledge and The Powerful by His Power.

ii. Al-Kulaynī's explanation of the sources of the Names of God.

Abū Hāshim al-Jaʿfarī reports that he was present when a man asked the Ninth Imām al-Jawwād (220 A.H.), 'How can we name our Lord "the Hearing"?' The Imām answered:

> He is 'The Hearing' because nothing is hidden from Him that can be acquired by the ears and we do not ascribe to Him the hearing occurring in the head; in the same way we name Him 'The Seeing' for what can be acquired by the eyes is not hidden from Him, and we do not ascribe to Him that He sees with the glance of the eye; in the same way we name Him 'The Latīf' (acquirer of subtleties) for having knowledge of the small things... and in the same way we name our Lord 'The Powerful', but not with the power of taking hold which is known in the 'created ones'. If He had power in terms of the power of taking hold as known in the 'created ones' then it would amount to tashbīh (acceptance of human attributes in regard to God).[2]

1. ibid, v.9, p.145.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., pp.116-7.

This report holds that according to the Shīʿī Faith God's being 'The Hearing' and 'The Seeing' denotes two different aspects of His Knowledge and these Attributes of His do not mean that He possesses the power of hearing and the power of seeing. This view points out that as regards God there is no difference of meaning in His being 'The Hearing' and in His being 'The Seeing' although these are two different Attributes of Him. God is ever-Knowing and his Knowledge covers all that can be heard or seen and this suggests that His being 'The Knower' is not other than His being 'The Hearing' and His being 'The Seeing'. Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām (114 A.H.) explains it more explicitly:

> They (some scholars of Irāq) lied and were heretical and compared God (with human beings); God is above these conceptions. He is ever-Hearing and ever-Seeing; He knows by what He sees and sees by what He knows.[1]

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām (148 A.H.), discusses the question at issue as follows:

> Our Lord has been for ever; He has been Knowing in His Being and there was nothing known. He was Hearing in His Being and there was nothing heard; He was Seeing in His Being and there was nothing seen; He was Powerful in His Being and there was nothing empowered. When He created things and that which was known existed His Knowledge was linked with that which was known; His hearing was linked with that which was heard; His seeing was linked with that which was seen and His Power was linked with that over which he had power.[2]

These statements of the Divine Imāms give an idea of taking 'the words expressing His Names and Attributes' not in their literal meanings; these are regarded as having conveyed a metaphorical sense. He is regarded as 'The Hearing' but it is not established that He possesses a source of hearing; He is regarded as 'The Knowing' but it is not believed that He possesses a source of knowledge; He is 'The Powerful' without possessing a source of power and so on. His link with 'the known', 'the empowered' and 'the heard' is also

1. ibid, v.1, p.108.
2. ibid, v.1, p.107.

not believed as existing from all eternity but His possession of knowledge, power and hearing is due merely to the fact that He can be described as 'The Knowing', 'The Powerful' and 'The Hearing.' They accept that His Attributes are subsistent in His Being, but they do not admit that He possesses the sources of knowledge, power and hearing.

This conception of His Names and Attributes is alleged to have established these Names as synonymous terms having no distinction from each other. The Eighth Imām, ʿAlī b. Mūsā al-Riḍā (203 A.H.), supports the metaphorical expression of His Names. He gives instances of such usage of the words as follows:

> Sometimes a man is said to be a dog, donkey, a bull, Sakkarah (an intoxicating plant), ʿalqamah (a bitter plant) and a lion. All these names are contrary to the man and his signs. These names are not then placed in their original meaning because a man is never a lion nor a dog.[1]

This explanation of God's Names and Attributes explicitly amounts to the denial of the distinctiveness of His Attributes and establishing them as merely synonymous terms which are believed to have stated the Unique God's unique Honour. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī reports this denial as having come down from ʿAlī, the First Imām:

> The excellence of God's Oneness is to keep Him above every association and the excellence of keeping Him above every association is to deny His Attributes; as it is apparent that every attribute is other than that to which it is attributed and it is also apparent that every qualified noun is other than its qualification.[2]

The eminent Shīʿī scholar Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (726 A.H.) attacks the Ashʿarīs in this context as follows:

> The Ashʿarīyah say that there are many 'Eternals' with God; and these are intrinsics which they prove as existing outwardly like Power, Knowledge,

1. ibid., v.1, p.121.
2. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, Nahj al-Balāghah, v.1, p.18.

> and so on. So they established Him as standing in need of Knowledge for being Knowing and of Power for being Powerful and so on; they do not admit that He is Powerful in His Being, Knowing in His Being, Living in His Being, and Mudrik (Perceptive) in His Being, but they admit Him as standing in need of these intrinsics for His Attributes. So God according to them is dependent and defective in His Being, only complete with something other than He.[1]

Al-Hillī's argument would be strong if the Ashʿarīs did hold the doctrine of God's possessing the Attributes as believed to be the other than He. But in fact we see that they express their belief in God's Knowledge and Power without admitting them to be other than He. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (324 A.H.) writes:

> Verily he is misled who thinks that God's Names are other than He. Indeed God possesses knowledge as He says that 'He revealed it by His Knowledge';[2] and 'no female bears nor brings forth but He possesses knowledge of it';[3] and we admit His hearing and seeing and we do not deny this as the Muʿtazilah, the Jahmiyah and the Khawārij have denied it; and we believe in His Power as He says, 'Do they not see that God who created them is mightier than they in Power.'[4] [5]

This expression of al-Ashʿarī suggests that when he considers God's Attributes as super-added to His Being he regards His Being as being 'Necessarily Existent' and believes that all His Names and Honours are different manifestations of that One Being, super-added to the idea of His being 'Necessarily Existent'. He does not take them as other than He and believes them to be Eternal and subsistent in Him. This view does not amount to belief in many Eternals. The Shīʿīs feel it difficult to admit that He possesses the relevant sources which are subsistent in Him and are not other than He. This complication led them

1. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, Minhāj al-Karāmah, p.83.
2. S 4:166.
3. S 35:11.
4. S 41:15.
5. Al-Ashʿarī, Kitāb al-Ibānah, pp.8-9.

to establish most of His Names and Attributes as synonymous terms bringing them close to the doctrine of ta'ṭīl (suspension of judgement concerning God's Names).

This difference of opinion laid the foundation-stone of the two variant dogmatics. In order to avoid tashbīh (acceptance of human metaphor in relation to God), the Shī'īs are alleged to have committed ta'ṭīl, to have denied the literal origin of God's Names and Attributes, and to have established them as carrying some metaphorical sense. The Sunnīs admit the statutes and the injunctions of the Qur'ān and the Prophet in their real meaning and reject the doctrine of tashbīh by stating that His Names and Attributes are not like any of the created things. But the Shī'īs accuse them of having indulged in tashbīh and consider the excellence of His Oneness in their denial of His Attributes and their acceptance of them in a metaphorical sense. The Sunnīs accuse the Shī'īs of having denied God's Attributes. Al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (816 A.H.) states as follows:

> So He is The Hearing possessing the source of hearing, The Seeing possessing the source of seeing, The Living possessing life; and the Philosophers and the Shī'īs deny these Attributes. It is true that the Shī'īs differ from the Philosophers in their having allowed one to name Him with His most excellent Names.[1]

Abū al-Thanā' Shams al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī (749 A.H.) gives a comprehensive statement in his Commentary on Ṭawāli' al-Anwār, the authentic work of al-Qāḍī al-Bayḍāwī (685 A.H.):

> The reported arguments prove that God is The Hearing and The Seeing. The words 'to hear' and 'to see' do not really mean 'to acknowledge the heard and the seen'. It is not permissible to mould the words from their real meanings to metaphorical language except when there is a contradiction (of the basic conceptions); and here there is no reason for transforming the reported arguments from their apparent meanings. So it is necessary to admit these Attributes in their implicit meanings which are safe from any contradiction.[2]

1. Al-Jurjānī, Sharḥ Mawāqif, pp.44-45.
2. Abū al-Thanā , Maṭāli' al-Anẓār, p.182.

Abū al-Thanā stresses the arguments given by the traditionists and does not allow one to over-rule the reported arguments. One should see what is said by a rightly authenticated tradition.

3. The relationship of the Names of God with His Essence.

i. Al-Bukhārī's attitude to the question at issue:

Al-Bukhārī first refutes the doctrine of the Muʿtazilīs (as well as of the Shīʿīs) that God is 'The Powerful One' without power and that He is 'The Knowing One' without knowledge;[1] and then he hints at the second issue that His Names are different expressions of His One Being and that they are not other than He. Al-Bukhārī lays down the following Chapter-heading just after having given the report of the Ninety-Nine Names:

> 'Asking through His Names and seeking refuge by them.'[2]

1. This is a clever debating point in this dogmatic discussion. The Shīʿīs do not mean by their denial of the Attributes of God that God lacks Power and Knowledge; they only deny the contingent power and knowledge, not the Power and Knowledge which is from all eternity existing in His Essence. Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying: 'He is Alive, but not with any fresh Life.' (op.cit., v.1., p.89). This suggests that the Shīʿīs always mean by their denial of God's Attributes fresh knowledge, fresh power, fresh seeing and fresh hearing. So the real difference rests in the lawful application of these words as His Attributes. Al-Bukhārī stands for this proof and quotes such applications from the Qurʾān and the Prophet and argues that the Muʿtazilīs' (as well as the Shīʿīs') denial of the Attributes establish all these applications as synonymous.

2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.145.

Al-Bukhārī suggests that asking through His Names and seeking Shelter by them prove that His Names are not other than He; otherwise this would contradict the basic belief in the Oneness of God and that there is only One to be worshipped, One to be asked for help[1] and One whose shelter is sought.[2]

Al-Bukhārī reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> When anyone of you goes to his bed, he should shake off his sheet three times and say, 'I lay down my side, O my Lord, in Your Name and by You I shall raise it.'[3]

The words 'You' and 'Your Name' coincide here so as to throw light on the concept that His Names are not other than He. Ḥudhayfah, the Companion (35 A.H.), also reports:

> When the Prophet went to his bed he said, 'O my God! I live and die in Your Name', and when he rose in the morning he said, 'All praise be to God Who raised us alive after He had made us dead and to Him is the awakening.'[4]

ʿAdīy b. Ḥātim, the Companion (67 A.H.), also reports the Prophet as saying:

> When you send your trained dogs and you mention the Name of God as they hold (the prey) you can eat (it).[5]

Al-Bukhārī in the same chapter reports the Prophet as saying:

> And for one who has not yet slaughtered the animal, he should slaughter in the Name of God.[6]

The Prophet also says:

> Do not swear by your fathers; and one who is required to take an oath should take that by God.[7]

1. The Qur'ān requires the Muslims to say: Thee do we worship and Thee do we beseech for help. (S 1:4).
2. Seek refuge in God. (S 16:98).
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.145.
4. ibid, v.9, p.146.
5. ibid, v.9, p. 146.
6. ibid., v.9, p.147.
7. ibid, v.9, p.147.

Al-Bukhārī mentions these traditions here to prove that His Names are not other than He; otherwise he would have already transmitted them in their respective chapters.[1] The eminent commentator of Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Khalaf known as Ibn Baṭṭāl (444 A.H.), comments that al-Bukhārī aims by this Chapter-heading of his to corroborate the statement that the Name is the named one and that is why to seek refuge by His Name is as rightful as to seek refuge by His Essence.[2]

This is not only the opinion of al-Bukhārī, but most of the traditionists corroborate this opinion of his. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī says:

> His Names are exactly He and this is the view of most of the Ḥadīth scholars.[3]

Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī (403 A.H.) quoted the following verses of the Qur'ān in support of this opinion:

> And eat not of that on which God's Name has not been mentioned for that is surely a transgression.[4]
>
> Glorify the Name of your Lord, the Most High.[5]
>
> Blessed be the Name of your Lord, the Lord of Glory and Honour.[6]

Then al-Bāqillānī comments:

1. See, ibid, v.7, p.113, 118; v.8, p.164.
2. Al-ʿAynī, ʿUmdat al-Qārī, v.11, p.528. Al-ʿAynī adds that this rule applies only in respect of God, as the author of Al-Tawḍīḥ has shown. Ibn Baṭṭāl, the commentator of Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, belongs to the Mālikī school of thought; so his comments illustrate the Mālikī opinion on this issue.
3. Al-Ashʿarī, Maqālāt, v.1, p.172. He further stated, 'It should not be said that His Names are other than He, as the Muʿtazilah and the Khawārij have stated.' ibid, v.1, p.290.
4. S 6:122.
5. S 87:1. Al-ʿAynī says, 'One who believes that the Name of God is created has thereby believed that God has commanded his Prophet to glorify a created thing'.(Al-ʿAynī, op.cit., v.11, p.528).
6. S 55:78.

> All these verses support the fact that most of the Asmā' (Names) are exactly the Musammā (One Who is named) and the name is different from the naming (tasmīyah).[1]

Abū al-Qāsim al-Qushayrī (465 A.H.) while discussing a tradition in his commentary on the most excellent Names says:

> There is an argument in this report that the Name is exactly the One Who is named; for had it been other than He the Names would have been other than He and God says, 'And God's are the most excellent Names, so call on Him thereby.'[2]

We have discussed here the Names of God, how they are exactly He; this is the view-point of al-Bukhārī. As regards the Attributes of God, they are not exactly He, just as they are not other than He. This will be discussed later. If the present discussion had been confined to the word 'Names' no dispute would have arisen as to whether they are exactly He or whether they are other than He. Al-Shaykh al-Akbar Muḥyi al-Dīn (638 A.H.) says that as a matter of veneration and decorum to God one should use the word Ism (Name) rather than Ṣifah (Attribute); he points out that Ṣifah does not occur in the Qur'ān although the Names are really the Attributes.[3]

1. Al-Bāqillānī, Kitāb al-Tamhīd, p.230.
2. Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, op.cit., v.11, p.188.
3. Al-Sha'rānī, Al-Yawāqīt, v.1, 77. It is true that the Names are really the Attributes but according to the mafhūm Dhahnī (the interior sense) of his Being the Attributes are not exactly He, just as they are not other than He in their exterior expression; though the sense of Ṣifāt (Attributes) is other than the sense of Dhāt (Essence), they (the Ṣifāt) do not conflict with Dhāt in their manifestation in the world. 'Alī al-Qārī says that the Companions, the Successors and the Theorists all agree that 'every Attribute from His Attributes is not He nor is it other than He.' (See, Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar, p.31). In regard to the word 'Names' no such comments had been made in the early times. Al-Ghazālī is probably the first Sunnī scholar who allows one to differentiate between Ism and Musammā. He seems to have considered the Ṣifat as equivalent to the Ism. Al-Rāzī (606 A.H.) says: 'The well-known opinion of our Sunnī scholars is that Ism (Name) is exactly the Musammā (One Who is named) and other than tasmīyah (the naming). The Mu'tazilah (as well as the Shī'īs) believe that Ism is exactly the tasmīyah and other than the Musammā. Al-Ghazālī holds that all three are distinct and I agree with him.' See al-'Asqalānī, op.cit., v.11, p.188.

His pupil, disciple and Successor Ṣadr al-Dīn (672 A.H.) also corroborates that the Names are exactly the One Who is named.[1] Al-Ashʿarī (324 A.H.) states the Sunnī doctrine that 'one who believes that God's Names are other than He is led astray.'[2]

ii. <u>Al-Kulaynī's attitude to the question at issue</u>:

We have already noted that the Shīʿī scholars agree with the Muʿtazilīs in many areas of dogmatics. They too believe that the Names are created things and not manifestations from all eternity of One Eternal Being. Al-Kulaynī lays down a Chapter-heading: "The creation of the Names". He then reports Jaʿfar al Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> The Name of God is other than He; and every thing upon which the name of thing is laid is created except God; and what the tongues speak or the hands do, that is created.[3]
>
> God was named by His Names and He is other than His Names and His Names are other than He.[4]

The Imām further states:

> The Name is other than the One Who is named; so one who has worshipped the Name and not the meaning has disbelieved and not worshipped anything; and one who has worshipped the Name and the meaning (the One who is named) has committed idolatry (associated a thing with God) and worshipped two things; and one who has worshipped the meaning and not the Name has established the Oneness of God.[5]

Abū Hāshim al-Jaʿfarī, the companion of the Ninth Imām al-Jawwād (220 A.H.) reports that he was present when a man asked the Imām:

> As regards God, tell me whether He has Names and Attributes in His Book? And whether His Names and Attributes are exactly He?

The Imām then answered as follows:

1. Al-Qūnawī, <u>Al-Fātiḥah</u> (<u>Tafsīr</u>), p.176.
2. Al-Ashʿarī, <u>Kitāb al-Ibānah</u>, p.8.
3. Al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.113.
4. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.114.
5. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p. 114.

> If you mean by saying that His Names and Attributes are He that He has numbers and multiplicity, then God is above this conception; and if you mean that the Attributes and Names are established from all eternity then eternity bears two implications; if it is taken that these are with Him in His Knowledge from ever and He is worthy of them then it is true and if you say that their written form, pronunciation and letters of the alphabet are established from eternity then God is above any association.... He, God, is established from all eternity but His Names and Attributes are created and their meanings and implications signify Him as God. He does not bear any diversity nor any combination; indeed one who branches off or combines has parts.[1]

This report bears evidence that the Shīʿīs do not completely reject the conception of God's Attributes but they admit the establishment of their purported meaning subsistent with Him and that They (the purported meanings) are not other than He.

This Shīʿī interpretation of God's Names and Attributes is not so very diverse from the Sunnī interpretation. Despite clear disagreement regarding His Names and Attributes as created or uncreated, the Shīʿīs and the Sunnīs do not vary in most other aspects of this concept. The eminent Sunnī scholar of dogmatics, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Saʿīd Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī (who lived in the 5th century A.H.),[2] elaborates this point:

> The Attributes of God are above multiplicity and numbers. He, may His Glory be exalted, is Doer by one action and He performs all His objects by one action. He is Alive with one Life and He hears with one hearing and He hears all that is heard by one hearing; and such are all His Attributes. It is implied therein that His Attributes are established for all eternity and having number and multiplicity are qualities of what is created.... If it is asked whether all Attributes of God are one or whether every Attribute is separate from the other, then we answer that there are some scholars among us

1. ibid, v.1, p.116.
2. Al-Sālimī states in one context that he heard something from Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Samarqandī... in 463 A.H. (Al-Sālimī, Al-Tamhīd, p.190)

> who say that God has the Attributes of Life, Might, Knowledge, and other Qualities, and that all these Attributes are separate from each other, but there are (other) scholars of ours who say that all His Attributes are one; and it is really true that all the Attributes of God are one[1] and that they are not linked in number, although His Expressions and Names are numerous.... If someone says that His Divine Power and Life are two things or two numbers or two, he becomes an infidel. So we say that Life is His Attribute and Power is His Attribute; thereby Power is not exactly the same as the Life nor is it other than Life; we say that It is not exactly the same nor other than the same.[2]

4. The words Dhāt (Essence), Ṣifāt (Attributes) and Nuʿūt (Qualities).

We find different words conveying the idea of His Essence and His Attributes and Qualities. The words Nafs, Dhāt, Naʿt and Ṣifah are frequently found in the Sunnī and Shīʿī traditions.

The words Dhāt and Ṣifāt do not occur in the Qurʾān nor were they ever mentioned by the Prophet. The Qurʾān mentions the word Nafs[3] in certain contexts and mentions Him mostly by His Names.

i. The Use of the word Nafs.

The Qurʾān mentions the Person of God by the word Nafs as follows:

> And God makes you to be cautious of Himself (His Nafs) and God is compassionate to the servants.[4]

1. This finds support in the statement of a Companion where he states all His Attributes given in Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ as being one Ṣifah (See, Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.141).
2. Al-Sālimī, op.cit., pp.56-57.
3. The origin of this word is either from nafas (breathing) or from nafīs (exquisite). The sense of the first does not harmonise with Islām's conception of God. ʿAlī al-Qārī favours the second, (op.cit., p.31).
4. S 3:29.

> 'Your Lord has ordained mercy on Himself (His Nafs)'.[1]

The Qur'ān mentions Jesus as saying to God:

> 'You know what is in my mind and I do not know what is in your mind (in your Nafs)'.[2]

God addresses Moses as follows:

> And I have made you for Myself (for My Nafs).[3]

(a) Al-Bukhārī's evidence.

Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as mentioning the word Nafs in transmitting one Ḥadīth Qudsī (God's saying) as follows:

> I am there where My servant thinks of Me and I am with him when he mentions Me; If he mentions Me in his mind I mention him in My mind (My Nafs) and if he mentions Me in a party I mention Him in a party better than theirs.[4]

The Prophet reports that Adam and Moses met each other (in the next world). Adam said to Moses:

> Are you the one whom God selected for His apostleship and made your selection for Himself (for His Nafs); and revealed to you Al-Tawrah.[5]

The Prophet himself made his supplication to God as follows:

> I cannot calculate Praise to You as You praised Yourself (Your Nafs).[6]

(b) Al-Kulaynī's evidence.

Al-Kulaynī also reports one Ḥadīth Qudsī in this context. He reports that God, The Mighty and Glorified, spoke to ʿĪsā as follows:

1. S 6:54.
2. S 5:116.
3. S 20-41.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.148.
5. ibid, v.6, p.120.
6. Mālik, Muʾwaṭṭā, v.1, p.167, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.263. There is no need to take this use of Nafs as based on mushākalah (similar use in comparison) as it also occurs at places where there is no similar use for anyone else.

> O ʿĪsā! Mention me in your mind; I shall mention you in My mind (in My Nafs) Mention Me in your party; I shall mention you in a party better than the party of human beings. O ʿĪsā! Soften your heart for Me and mention Me in a large measure amply in your solitudes. Know that My pleasure is in your tenderness towards Me. Be alive in this and do not be dead.[1]

ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, was asked how he recognised His Lord The Imām answered:

> I recognised Him as He introduced Himself (His Nafs) to me.[2]

Al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, states:

> Then God has named His Person (His Nafs) The Hearing, The Seeing, The Powerful, The Existing, The Speaking.[3]

Al-Kulaynī uses the word Nafs[4] extensively for His Person and he means by that word The Essence of God. There is no Sunnī and Shīʿī confrontation on this issue.

ii. The use of the word Dhāt.

Although the word Dhāt is not found in the Qurʾān or in the Prophetic usage, it is substantiated by the Companions.

(a) The Sunnī evidence.

Al-Bukhārī cites Khubayb, the Companion, as using the word Dhāt for God's Essence. This is the first use of this word in Islāmic discussion. Khubayb says:

> And I do not care when I am killed (not through any default of mine) since I am a Muslim, on whatever side I may fall; and that is for His sake (in the Dhat of God); and if He wills He may bring good fortune to the parts of the cut limbs.[5]

Al-ʿAynī reports that the Prophet heard[6] this statement of Khubayb and did not make any objection to it. So this word obtained the approval of the Prophet.

(b) The Shīʿī evidence.

The Shīʿīs trace the word Dhāt back to ʿAlī, the First

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.502.
2. ibid, v.1, p.86.
3. ibid, v.1, p.120.
4. See, ibid, v.1, pp.75, 127, 146.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.7, p.147.
6. Al-ʿAynī, op.cit., v.11, p.531.

Imām, as follows:

> The hearts long for Him to be acquainted with the modes of His Ṣifāt (Attributes); and the paths of reason have gone deep so that His Dhāt (Essence)[1] cannot be acquired through the Attributes.

This report suggests that Dhāt is the centre of all Attributes and the Attributes are different manifestations of One Dhāt. So the word Dhāt is used both by Sunnīs and Shīʿīs.

iii. The use of the word Ṣifah.

We have already noted that the word Ṣifah does not occur in the Qurʾān nor was it ever used by the Prophet. But we find extensive use of it in the Sunnī and Shīʿī traditions although the Shīʿīs do not accept this word in an agreed order as they have accepted the words Nafs and Dhāt in their full agreement with the Sunnīs. However we shall discuss this later on along with al-Kulaynī's explanation of the Nuʿūt of God.

(a) Al-Bukhārī's evidence.

Al-Bukhārī reports a Companion as mentioning this word. He was sent by the Prophet to lead battle-troops. In his prayer with them he recited the Qurʾān and ended his recitation at Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ. When they came back they mentioned this to the Prophet. The Prophet directed them to ask him why he did so. They asked him and he answered that it (Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ) was the Ṣifah of the Beneficent and he liked to recite that. The Prophet, then, said:

> Tell him that God loves him.[2]

Al-Bukhārī says:

> The Prophet has called the Qurʾān a shayʾ and it is a Ṣifah from the Ṣifāt (Attributes) of God.[3]

Al-Bukhārī uses the word of Ṣifāt in some of his Chapter-headings ; but in his main Chapter-heading for this

1. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.1, p.161.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.141.
3. ibid, v.9, p.151.

discussion he uses the word Nuʿūt for God's Qualities.

(b) Al-Kulaynī's evidence.

In the time of al-Kulaynī (328 A.H.) the use of the word Ṣifah had attained frequency and we find its frequent use in Al-Kāfī.[1] He mentions it on the authority of the Divine Imāms and mostly rejects the idea of God's having Attributes. However we shall discuss this later on.[1-a] In their metaphorical explanations of the words mentioning His Ṣifāt and Nuʿūt they do not differentiate between Ṣifāt and Nuʿūt although they more boldly reject the former. So we shall discuss the Shīʿī outlook in regard to the Ṣifāt alongside the Nuʿūt of God.

iv. The use of the word Nuʿūt.

The Arabs use this word to state the features of a thing. Al-Tirmidhī reports Abū Bakrah, the Companion, as saying:

> The Prophet then told us the features (naʿata lanā) of the parents of al-Dajjāl.[2]

Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports that he heard from the Prophet that when there would be a dispute among the people there would appear in revolt a party (hinting at the appearance of the Khawārij); and he said that he was also present when ʿAlī fought against them. He further says:

> The man who was pointed out to them was searched for from among the killed ones. He was traced and he bore the feature (naʿt) of which the Prophet had told.[3]

Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī (died in the 5th A.H.), writes:

> The word naʿt in its literal sense means something by which a thing manifests itself in such a way that it cannot depart from it, such as an eye, nose, eyebrow, and hand; and ṣifah is a thing which befalls and departs such as colour and speech.[4]

1. See, Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, pp.94,100,107,108,109,111,140.
1-a. See, pp. 73-76.
2. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.40.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.47; v.9, p.22.
4. Al-Sālimī, op.cit., p.27.

This explanation suggests that the word na't is very near to the idea of features, so long as it is not applied to an organic body. Al-Kulaynī also corroborates this use of the word na't in respect of God, and reports:

> God has Na't but He is above (having) an organic body.[1]

We shall discuss this later on under the sub-heading 'Al-Kulaynī's explanation of the Nu'ūt of God'.

5. The explanation of the Nu'ūt of God.

i. Al-Bukhārī's explanation of the Nu'ūt of God.

Al-Bukhārī asserts that God has Nu'ūt and he mentions this point in the following Chapter-heading:

> What is mentioned in regard to His Dhāt and His Nu'ūt and in His Names; and Khubayb (the Companion) said, 'and that is in God's Dhāt'; so he mentioned Dhāt for His Name.[2]

Under this Chapter-heading al-Bukhārī gives the traditions mentioning His Face, Eye, Hand and Fingers. He has already discussed the Names of God and His Attributes in the preceding discussion. So we do not agree with al-'Aynī's comments that it would have been better if al-Bukhārī had mentioned the word al-Awṣāf instead of Nu'ūt.[3]

Al-Bukhārī does not mean that God has organic features. He clearly states that the conception of God's Attributes and His Expressions is quite different from that of the created ones. Al-Bukhārī states:

> His (God's) creating into existence bears no resemblance to how the created ones bring their actions into existence. There is no one as He is and He is The Hearing and The Seeing.[4]

Al-Bukhārī asserts He cannot be imagined as a human body, yet he does not accept the metaphorical interpretation of these Nu'ūt (Qualities) as the Mu'tazilīs do; and he does not mean by 'His Hand' His Divine Power only, as this amounts

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.105.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.147.
3. Al-'Aynī, op.cit., v.11, p.531.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.187. The first part of the last sentence refutes the doctrine of the Mushabbihah and the second part of that refutes the doctrine of the Mu'aṭṭilah (See, 'Ali al-Qārī, op.cit., p.35).

to falsification of these Qualities. In the opinion of the traditionists the conception of God's Qualities and Attributes was in this way being robbed of all its contents.

(a) The Nuʿūt: the Face, the Eye, the Hand.

Al-Bukhārī does not interpret them but leaves the state of their implied meaning, as well as the modes of His Attributes, to God. At the same time he requires the Muslims to believe in these Qualities and Attributes of Him as they believed in other mutashābihāt (points of uncertainty).[1] Al-Bukhārī suggests that if they had been allusions and metaphors only, they would not have been so frequently mentioned in the Qur'ān and the traditions. This bears evidence that they have their own actual meanings which are better known to God.

Al-Bukhārī uses the following verse of the Qur'ān as a sub-heading under this main Chapter-heading of Nuʿūt:

> Everything will perish but His own Face.[2]

Al-Bukhārī then transmits from Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion (74 A.H.), concerning the circumstances of the revelation of the following verse of the Qur'ān, as follows:

> Say, 'He has the Power that He should send on you a chastisement from above you (or beneath your feet) or that He should throw you into confusion among different parties.'[3]

The Prophet said, 'I seek refuge by Your Face, O my Lord'; then he recited 'or beneath your feet' and said, 'I seek refuge by Your Face'; he then recited, 'or He should throw you into confusion' and said that it was a lighter chastisement.[4]

1. Like the beginning letters of some of the Sūras of the Qur'ān known as muqaṭṭaʿāt.
2. S 28:88. The word Face occurs in many verses: 'Wheresoever you turn there is God's Face' (S 2:115); 'All that is on earth will perish and the Face of your Lord will abide' (S 55;27); 'But to seek for the Face of his Lord Most High' (S 92;20).
3. S 6:65.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.148.

Al-Bukhārī then gives the following verse of the Qur'ān as a sub-heading:

> And you might be brought up under My Eye.[1]

He then reports the Prophet as saying that the Dajjāl is one-eyed but that your God is not one-eyed.[2]

Then there is a sub-heading 'to whom I have created with My Hand'[3] under which al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as saying:

> God will assemble the believers on the Last Day and they will say, 'Let us seek intercession with Our Lord so that He may move our place to the better.' They shall then go to Adam and shall say, 'O Adam! Do you not see the people? God created you with His Hand and to you He made His angels do obeisance and told you the names of everything. Intercede for us with our Lord, so that He may relieve us from the position which we have.' But he will reply, 'I am not in a position to do that.'[4]

Al-Bukhārī suggests by this report of his that God has Hands and he holds that it does not mean His Divine Power. He further reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> God's Hand is full, undiminished by any expenditure. He continuously pours down (His bounties) night and day. Did they see that He spent anything when He created the heaven and the earth? Yet what His Hand holds has not decreased. His Throne is upon the water and in His other Hand is the scale by which He lowers and raises.[5]

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion (73 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> On the day of resurrection God will hold the earth and the heaven will be in His Right Hand. He will then say 'I am the King'.[6]

1. S 20:38. The Qur'ān relates in another place, 'And make the boat before Our Eyes and according to Our revelation' (S 11:37).
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.148.
3. S 38:75.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9., p.149.
5. ibid, v.9, p.150.
6. ibid, v.7, p.150.

The Qur'ān says:

> And the whole earth shall be in His grip on the Day of Resurrection and the heavens folded in His Right Hand; Glory be to Him and may He be exalted above what they associate (with Him).[1]

Muslim (261 A.H.) reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr (67 A.H.) and Abū Bakr (13 A.H.) the Companions, as transmitting from the Prophet as follows:

> Those who act justly will be with God on pulpits of light at the Right Hand of the Beneficent One, the Mighty and the Glorified, and both His Hands are Right. They are those who are just in their jurisdiction, towards their people and what is under their charge.[2]

Al-Tirmidhī (279 A.H.) also reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> Both Hands of my Lord the Blessed are Right.[3]

These reports clearly state that God's Nuʿūt (Qualities) are not like human features, and that right and left are the distinction of the created, and the Creator is above all this human conception, even though there is ample evidence that God has Qualities and that words used for them imply meanings different from those of the human being and these are better known to God.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Scholar Companion (32 A.H.), told how a Jewish Doctor came to the Prophet and (in light of the Scriptures) said:

> On the Day of Resurrection, O Muhammad, God will hold the heavens on a finger, the earth on a finger, the mountains on a finger, the trees on a finger and the rest of the creation on a finger. He will then say, 'I am the King.'[4]

1. S 39:67.
2. Muslim, op.cit., v.6, p.7. Al-Kulaynī also gives a similar report that Both His Hands are Right (op.cit., v.2, p.126).
3. Al-Tabrīzī (with reference to al-Tirmidhī) op.cit., p.400.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.150, 151, 165, 181. Al-Bukhārī reports in this last Chapter that the Prophet recited the complete verse of the Qur'ān (thereby suggesting the Prophet's approval, whereas the part-quotation may suggest his disapproval).

The Prophet (on account of being pleased) then laughed and recited the verse 'They have not honoured God truly.'[1] Muslim reports the Prophet himself as mentioning the word Finger in relation to God as follows:

> The hearts of all men are between the two Fingers of the Beneficent, the Compassionate, as if they were one heart which He directs as He wills.[2]

Al-Tirmidhī reports the word Foot also in relation to God and then concludes the Sunnī doctrine in this respect as follows:

> On this point it is the doctrine of the men of learning, the Imāms like Sufyān al-Thawrī (161 A.H.), Mālik b. Anas (179 A.H.), Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah (198 A.H.), Ibn al-Mubārak (156 A.H.), Wakīʿ (197 A.H.) and others like them, that they emit these ashyā' (things) and say that these traditions should be transmitted and that they believe in them, but it should not be asked what are the modes (of these nuʿūt). This is the finding of the men of tradition that they transmit these ashyā', as they reached (them); and they believe in them but these are not to be interpreted, nor is any explanation given to them, nor could their modes be expressed. This is the opinion of the men of learning who have accepted them and accordingly believed in them.[3]

The outlook of Sunnī traditionists had clearly been depicted in this statement of al-Tirmidhī, the pupil of al-Bukhārī.

(b) The establishment of God on His ʿArsh (Throne).

Al-Bukhārī lays down another Chapter-heading and asserts that God is on His Throne and He is the Lord of the Great Throne. The Chapter speaks as follows:

> And His Throne was on the water; and He is the Lord of the Great Throne; Abū al-ʿĀliyah (90 A.H.) says that 'He directed Himself to the heaven' means 'He raised (elevated) Himself on the heavens'; 'formed them (the heavens)' means 'created them'. Mujāhid (100 A.H.) says, 'His directing Himself to the Throne means ascended on to the Throne'.[4]

1. S 39:67.
2. Muslim, op.cit., v.8, p.51.
3. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.92.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.151.

It is true that the Modes of His establishment on the Throne are not claimed as being fully known to the believers nor is it like the human being's sitting on a Throne; yet al-Bukhārī is not prepared to interpret metaphorically this quality of God, since the mention of Al-ʿArsh occurs at various places[1] in the Qurʾān. Al-Bukhārī reports ʿImrān b. Ḥuṣayn, the Companion (52 A.H.), as saying:

> I was with the Prophet when some people of Tamīm came to him. The Prophet said to them, ' Receive the good news, O Banū Tamīm,' and they replied, 'You have given us good news but give us rather something tangible.' Then some of the people of Yaman entered. The Prophet then said, 'Receive the good news, O people of Yaman, since the Banū Tamīm have not accepted that'. They replied, 'We have accepted it; we have come to you to become versed in religion and to ask you what was the beginning of this matter.' The Prophet said, 'God existed (from all eternity) and there was nothing before Him and His Throne was upon the water. He then created the heavens and the earth and inscribed everything on the Memorial (the Preserved Tablet.)[2]

Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> Verily! When God decreed to create, He inscribed in the Book (Preserved Tablet) with Him from upon His Throne, 'My Mercy has preceded My anger.'[3]

Al-Bukhārī further reports Zaynab, the Mother of the Faithful (20 A.H.), as boasting:

> God has performed my marriage from above the seven heavens.[4]

The Sunnī traditionists do not allow the interpretation of the modes of these Nuʿūt (Qualities) of God. Such expressions occur in the Qurʾān and the Sunnīs apply the same method to

1. See, S 10:3, S 13:2, S 20:5, S 25:59, S 32:4, S 57:4.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.152.
3. ibid, v.4, p.129.
4. ibid, v.9, p.153. ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, (307 A.H.), the Shīʿī traditionist, and commentator, also reports that God performed that marriage from above the seven heavens. (See, op.cit., v.2, p.173).

these traditions as they had applied to those allegorical verses of the Qur'ān, and such traditions can apparently be reconciled with the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān says:

> Are you safe from Him Who is in the heavens that He should make the earth to swallow you up ... are you safe from Him Who is in the heavens that He should send down upon you a punishment.[1]

Avoiding the idea of anthropomorphism, the Sunnīs leave such expressions in their apparent meaning without discussing their modes. They abhor rationalising them, for, with them, dogma has for its real basis the Qur'ān and the Traditions.

ii. Al-Kulaynī's explanation of the Nuʿūt of God.

Al-Kulaynī reports al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām (d.203 A.H.), as saying:

> God has Naʿt but He is above having an organic body.[2]

The Shīʿīs do not keep the verses of the Qur'ān and the traditions mentioning the Nuʿūt (Qualities) of God in their apparent expression; and they, the Shīʿīs, rationalise them and interpret them in their own way. So it is very difficult to differentiate between Ṣifāt (Attributes) and Nuʿūt (Qualities) from the Shīʿī point of view although they welcome the word Naʿt without any objection and reject the word Ṣifah in its apparent expression; yet they allow it under certain conditions. That is why they discuss Ṣifāt and Nuʿūt alike.

Abū Hāshim al-Jaʿfarī reports that he was present when a man came to Abū Jaʿfar the Second, (Al-Jawwād, the Ninth Imām), and asked the Imām why they had named their Lord 'The Hearing'? The Imām, then, states:

> He is 'The Hearing' since what is acquired by the ears is not hidden from Him; but we do not attribute to Him the hearing acquired in the head. In the same way we name Him 'The Seeing'

1. S 67:16-7.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.105.

> since what is acquired by the eyes, i.e.colour, person or anything, is not hidden from Him and we do not attribute to Him 'the seeing by movement of the eyelids.' In the same way we name Him 'The Knower of subtleties' for His knowing of the mysteries and all the minute things like mosquitoes or anything still more minute than that, its state of growth, its sense, its lust for mating and its affection for its offspring, establishing them in their mutual duties, and its carrying food and water to its progeny in the mountains, fields, valleys or deserts. So we know that its creator is The Knower of subtleties, the mode of which is not known;for the modes which are known relate to the created. In the same way we name our Lord 'The Powerful' not for the power of gripping, known in the created one; for if His Power meant the power of gripping which is recognised in the created one then it would be a tashbīh (anthropomorphism). Also there would be potentiality for increase and where there is room for increase there is potentiality for decrease; and one who is imperfect cannot be Qadīm (existing from all eternity) and one who is not Qadīm is deficient. So our Lord, the Blessed and The Exalted, has no comparison, no opposition, no associate, no particular mode, no end nor anything which could be seen by the eyes; it is forbidden for the hearts to adduce an example for Him, for the imaginations to limit Him, and for the inward thoughts to formulate what He is. He is Glorified and Exalted from the features of the created and the marks of the creature; and He is above all this in mighty Exaltation.[1]

This report bears evidence that so far as His Person is concerned, there is no distinction between God's being 'The Hearing' and 'The Seeing' and that both have no distinction for His Being the Knower of all things. This suggests that the Names have no reality of their own, but only in their relation to the created world. As regards His Person all the Names carry a metaphorical sense.

Al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām (203 A.H.), explains the point at issue as follows:

> Know this! may God guide you to what is good. Verily God, The Blessed and The Exalted, is Qadīm and it is His being Qadīm in His Attributes which leads the reasonable one to believe that there was nothing before Him and that none joins Him in His

1. ibid, v.1, p.117.

> Eternity. Then God, the Blessed and the Exalted, states the quality of His Person (Nafs) by Names by which He called the created ones to call upon Him after He created them, made them His servants, and put them on trial. So He named Himself the Hearing, the Seeing, the Omnipotent, the Subsisting, the Speaking, the Evident, the Immanent, the Knower of subtleties, the well-acquainted, the Powerful, the Mighty, the Wise, the Knowing and other Names like these. Then those who disbelieve and are not happy (with us) considered these Names and they had heard us discussing about God that nothing is like him and nothing of the created is in His State; so they asked, 'Tell us; when you believe that nothing is like Him or similar to Him, then how can you unify Him with His most Excellent Names, having applied all of them for yourself? It suggests that you are like Him in all or some of His States when you are associated with the Good Names'. (The Imām said:) They would be given the answer, 'Verily! God has applied the names from His Names to His servants in another sense (carrying different meanings) and this is in the same way as one noun covers two different meanings; a pointer to this is their lawful and well-published saying; God has addressed His creaturesin this way and spoken to them by the words which they understood, so that it might be an authority against them for the wastage they made (of their lives); it is said of a man 'dog', 'donkey', 'bull', 'sakkarah' (an intoxicating plant), ''alqamah' (a bitter plant), 'lion', yet all these names are contradictory to him and to his states; these names do not relate to their original meanings for which they were formed, as the human being is not a lion nor a dog. Learn this lesson and God may be Merciful to you.'

The Imām then gave eight examples to elaborate the point that the created ones unify Him only in name and not in the meanings. We quote two of them:

> Our Lord has been named 'The Hearing' not for the part of the body by which He hears the voice as opposed to seeing with it, as we hear by a part of the body by which we cannot see; but God says that no voice is hidden from Him. So this does not have the same meaning as that term with which we ourselves have been named; thus we share in the name for hearing but we are distinct in regard to the meaning. The same is the case with His seeing; He does not see by a part of the body as we see by a part of our body from which we enjoy no other benefit. But God is the Seeing from Whom no body is unknown which can be seen by the eyes. So we make a combination in names and we make a distinction

in meaning.[1]

This report bears ample evidence that according to the Shīʿī faith the Names of God do not give any literal sense nor have they been used in their real meaning; but in regard to their relation to God they convey only a metaphorical sense.

(a) The Nuʿūt, the Face, the Eye, the Hand.

The Shīʿīs also interpret the words Hand, Eye and Face with metaphorical meanings as do the Muʿtazilīs. Al-Majlisī corroborates the explanation of Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar al-Zamakhsharī (538 A.H.) as follows:

> The hand of that man is mabsūṭah (stretched forth) and the hand of the other is maghlūlah (tied up); this carries the meanings that one is generous and the other is a miser..., so that if someone does not extend his hand with alms or if he does not actually possess a hand but he is generous, it is still right to say that his hand is stretched forth.[2]

This explanation has been given in the context of the following verse of the Qurʾān:

> And the Jews say 'The Hand of God is tied up!' Their hands shall be shackled and they shall be cursed for what they say; not so - Both His Hands are stretched forth; He expends as He likes.[3]

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, explains the verse of the Qurʾān 'Everything will perish except His Own Face'[4] as follows:

> One who came to God by obeying the Prophet according to the commandment, he is the Face which will not perish.[5]

The Imām further states:

> Verily God created us and made our forms good and made us His Eye among His servants; and His Speaking Tongue for His servants; and His Spread-out Hand with affection and mercy; and

1. ibid, v.1, pp.120-121.
2. Al-Majlisī, Mirʾat al-ʿUqūl, v.1, p. 87.
3. S 5:64.
4. S 28:88.
5. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.143.

> His Face by which approach is made to Him; and His Door which leads to Him.[1]

Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, states:

> We are the Qur'ān[2] which God bestowed upon our Prophet Muḥammad and we are the Face of God, moving among you on the earth; and we are the Eye of God to His creation and His Hand spread out with mercy towards His servants. There are some who acknowledged us and there are some who did not recognise us and did not recognise our Imāmah as being for those who fear God.[3]

'Alī, the Commander of the Faithful, states of himself:

> I am the Eye of God; I am the Hand of God; I am the Side of God; and I am the Door of God.[4]

These are the qualities of the Divine Imāms and these give a metaphorical sense; nor do the Sunnīs reject this metaphorical application to the men of excellent qualities. It is permissible among them that a man may attain a proximity and nearness to God so as to become His ear, His eye and His hand; but as regards God the Sunnīs do not allow one to give such metaphorical interpretation to the Qualities of God. They assert that a man is well-recognised and well-known in every aspect of his essence; and the real meaning and metaphorical aspects of his attributes could easily be differentiated from each other. But as regards God His Essence is not perfectly recognised and completely known by the human beings and it is not advisable to discuss His Person[5] in detail as His Person is above the intellectual

1. ibid, v.1, p.144.
2. The Imām aims to explain that we stand side by side with the Qur'ān in the last Will of the Prophet regarding the two weighty things, the Qur'ān and the Family of the Prophet. The Prophet combined them with the Qur'ān.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.143.
4. ibid, v.1, p.145.
5. Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, says, 'Discuss the creature of God and do not discuss about God because discussion about God does not benefit anyone with anything but amazement', ibid, v.1, p.92. Al-Bukhārī also reports the Prophet as giving instructions that when going deep into discussion about God man should stop thinking about it. (See, Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.19).

approach of the created ones. In metaphorical use of the words there is always a relation between the real meanings and the metaphorical meanings, and whereas the modes of Attributes are not perfectly comprehended it is not advisable to establish them in a purely metaphorical sense so as to be completely unrelated to its real contents. On the contrary, the Sunnīs allow such metaphors to be applied to men. Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as stating (a Ḥadīth Qudsī) that God says:

> No one comes near to me with anything dearer for me than what I have not made obligatory for him. If my servant keeps drawing near to me with nawāfil (supererogatory acts) I shall love him, and when I shall love him I shall be his ear with which he hears, his eye with which he sees, his hand with which he grasps and his foot with which he walks; if he asks from me I shall certainly give him and if he seeks refuge in me I shall certainly give him refuge.[1]

This tradition, in its apparent meaning, is consistent with the preceding Shīʿī traditions, but the Sunnī traditionists report such traditions in relation to the excellent qualities of human beings whereas the Shīʿī traditionists report those traditions so as to interpret the Nuʿūt (Qualities) of God. The Sunnī traditionists do not give the metaphorical interpretation to the Qualities of God.

(b) The Establishment of God on His ʿArsh (Throne)

The Sunnī traditionists, as we have already noted, do not allow one to discuss the modes of His istiwā (establishment) on His Throne; but the Shīʿī traditionists have discussed this in detail. Before we give the approach of al-Kulaynī to this issue it may be appropriate to give al-Majlisī's discussion in this context. Muḥammad al-Bāqir al-Majlisī says:

> Verily istiwā carries various meanings; 1. to stay and to be established upon a thing; 2. to set the mind on a thing and turn towards that; 3.

1. ibid, p.197.

> to overcome and control a thing; 4. to set a thing right; 5. to be equal in relation to a thing. As to the first meaning, it does not apply to God for it is proved by rational and reported arguments that God is above particular location. There are commentators who interpret this verse of the Qur'ān according to the second meaning ... The majority of the commentators interpret it in accordance with the third meaning that God overcame the Throne, controlled it and managed it.... The fourth meaning can also be considered: that it is an allusion to His being above all elements which have a distinctive existence (a discrepancy).... As regards the fifth meaning it is evident (and implied) in accordance with the transmitted reports.[1]

Al-Kulaynī reports that Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām (148 A.H.), was asked to interpret the istiwā of God on His Throne. The Imām answered:

> He became equidistant from everything; so nothing is nearer to Him than any other thing.[2]
>
> The remote is not far from Him and the nearer is not at a short distance from Him. He is equal to all things.[3]

Apart from the different explanations of istiwā the word 'arsh (Throne) has also been metaphorically interpreted. Al-Kulaynī has explained it to mean knowledge. He reports that 'Alī, the Commander of the Faithful, was asked to explain the following verse of the Qur'ān:

> And eight will on that Day bear the Throne of your Lord above them.[4]

'Alī, the First Imām, answered as follows:

> It is knowledge which God has caused the bearers to bear and it is light from His Magnificence.[5]

'Alī Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, also says:

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., al-'Uqūl, v.1, p.87.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.127.
3. ibid, v.1, p.128, Al-Qummī, v.2, p.59.
4. S 69:17.
5. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.129.

> Al-ʿarsh does not mean God; it is a name of Knowledge, Power, and there is everything in it.[1]

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, explains the bearers of al-ʿArsh as follows:

> As for the bearers of al-ʿArsh, al-ʿArsh means the Knowledge, and they are eight: four from us (the Family of the Prophet) and four from those whom God likes.[2]

Mullā al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (1091 A.H.) reports Mūsā al-Kāẓim, the Seventh Imām (183 A.H.) as naming the eight bearers as follows:

> When the last Day shall come, the bearers of al-ʿArsh will be eight, four from the former ones: Nūḥ, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā and ʿIsā, and four from the latter ones: Muḥammad, ʿAlī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.[3]

In the light of this metaphorical interpretation of al-ʿArsh there is no difficulty in interpreting the word istiwā in its third meaning, namely that He is firm in control of the Universe having no weakness in His Knowledge; and the names of the bearers given above, in spite of their different times, harmonise nicely with this interpretation.

6. The various Attributes of God and their different categories.

The Sunnīs and the Muʿtazilīs as well as the Shīʿīs all agree that the Attributes of God have different categories, Ṣifāt al-Dhāt, (Attributes of His Essence) and Ṣifat al-Fiʿl (Attributes of His Action); but they differ in their interpretation of these different categories. Then there are some minute differences among the various schools of the Sunnīs, the Ashʿarīs and the Māturīdīs. The Karrāmīs also fall into dispute with the Muʿtazilīs in some of their assessments in regard to the different categories of the Attributes. However, before we discuss the comparative

1. ibid, v.1, p.131.
2. ibid, v.1, p.132.
3. Al-Kāshānī, Al-Wāfī. See footnote on al-Kulaynī, op. cit., v.1, p.132.

approach of al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī on this issue, we give here a brief description of these different categories of the Attributes.

The Ashʿarīs believe in Seven Attributes of God which are existent in His Being, i.e. Life, Knowledge, Power, Hearing, Seeing, Speech and Intention; and as regards those of His Actions which are likely to cause life, to cause death, or to provide subsistence, they all come under His Attribute of Power and Intention and are not the Attributes of His Essence but the Attributes of His Actions. Abū Ḥanīfah says that these Attributes of His Actions come under His Attribute of takwīn (Invention) which is existent in His Being and is different from His Intention and His Power. So the Essential Attributes, according to the Māturīdīs (Ḥanafīs) are Eight. The Ashʿarīs state takwīn (Invention) as being al-Ṣifat al-Iḍāfīyah (the Relative Attribute) and not as being His Essential Attribute.

The Muʿtazilīs and a group of Karrāmīs believe that there are only Five Attributes of God which are Essential and existent in His Being. They do not accept Intention and Speech as Attributes of His Essence. They assert that all the Attributes other than His Life, Knowledge, Power, Hearing and Seeing are Nuʿūt and not Ṣifāt.[1] They argue that there are Attributes which negate at times and affirm at times and these cannot be accepted as Essentials. The Qurʾān says:

i. And He intends ease for you and does not intend to put you in difficulty.[2]

ii. 'And God spoke to Mūsā speaking to him';[3] 'And God will not speak to them, nor will He look upon them on the day of Resurrection.'[4]

The Muʿtazilīs suggest, by this explanation of theirs, that Intention and Speech are not the Attributes of His Essence. Al-Kulaynī agrees with the Muʿtazilīs and does not regard

1. See, Al-Sālimī, op.cit., p.47.
2. S 2:185.
3. S 4:164.
4. S 3:76.

Intention as being among His Essential Attributes.[1] We shall explain the Shīʿī doctrine later on; here we have mentioned their fundamental conception in this context. Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī gives the Sunnī conception as follows:

> The Ashʿarīs believe that the Attribute the negation of which establishes its opposite is the Attribute of Essence; if you negate Life death is established; and if you negate Power helplessness is established; and it is the same with the relation of Knowledge with ignorance. And the Attributes the negation of which does not establish their opposites are the Attributes of Actions; for, if you negate the Attribute of causing life or of causing death, or of creating anything or of providing subsistence (to anyone), its opposite is not established. In the same way if you negate Intention, constraint and helplessness would be established; and if you negate from Him speech, dumbness and silence would be established. So it is proved that Intention and Speech are the Attributes of Essence. As regards us (the Ḥanafīs), every Attribute the opposite of which cannot be ascribed to Him is the Attribute of Essence, i.e. Power, Knowledge, Might and Magnificence; and everything by which and by the opposite of which He can be recognised is the Attribute of Action, i.e. Compassion, Mercy and Passion and Anger.[2]

Apart from these two categories Ibn Hammām al-Iskandarī (861 A.H.) mentions another series of the perfections of His Attributes as being ʿadl (justice), iḥsān (obligingness) and ḥikmah (wisdom).[3]

So as to their relation to God there are five categories of these facts: Al-asmāʾ al-Ḥusnā (the most Excellent Names), Ṣifāt al-Dhāt (the Essential Attributes), Nuʿūt (the Qualities), Ṣifāt al-Afʿāl (the Attributes of His Actions) and the Kamālāt al-Ṣifāt (the Perfections of His Attributes.)

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī on the points at issue.

Al-Bukhārī returns to the subject of Attributes and lays down the following Chapter-heading:

1. See, al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.109.
2. ʿAlī al-Qārī, op.cit., p.24.
3. Ibn Hammām, Al-Taḥrīr, p.231.

> What has come down (to us) regarding the creation of the heavens and the earth and other created things; and it is the Action of the Lord, the Blessed, and the Exalted, and His amr (Command). So it is the Lord with His Attributes, His Actions, His Command and His Speech, Who is the Creator and the Inventor and not one who is created; and what has occurred by His Action, His Command, His Creation and His Invention, that is the made, the created and the invented.[1]

Al-Bukhārī states here that His Attributes are existent with Him and are not created. Apart from His being the Creator he accepts His takwīn (Invention) as an Independent Attribute which relates to all His Actions, Commands and His Speech. With His Speech also God is the Creator, the Inventor, and not the created one; this suggests that the speech as related to Him is not created; so the Qur'ān being related to Him and being the Kalām (Speech) of God is not created. Al-Bukhārī lays stress here on the issues of takwīn and kalām. Before we discuss it in detail it is appropriate to give here the Ḥanafī approach in regard to takwīn, with which al-Bukhārī is in agreement.

(a) The difference between takwīn (Invention) and Irādah (Intention)

Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī, the Mujaddid (1035 A.H.), explains the difference as follows:

> The true position is that takwīn (Invention) is an Independent Essential Attribute besides Qudrah (Power) and Irādah (Intention). Its explanation is that Qudrah covers the right to do an action and the right not to do it (alike);[2] and Irādah particularises one of these two sides of Qudrah i.e. doing and not doing. So the Qudrah has the first position and Irādah has the second; and takwīn which we accept as an Independent Attribute has the third position. Its function is to invent that which is particularised (by Irādah). The Qudrah validates the action, the Irādah particularises one side and takwīn invents it. So takwīn is Essential.[3]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.165.
2. Al-Qādir is One for whom it is right both to act and not to act. See, al-Bayḍāwī, Ṭawāl' al-Anwār, p.168.
3. Aḥmad Sirhindī, Mabda' wa-Ma'ād, p.41.

the position of takwīn as being next after Irādah is found in the Qur'ān as follows:

> Verily, when He intends (arāda) a thing, His command is 'Be' (kun) and it exists (Yakūnu).[1]

Al-Sālimī (the eminent scholar of the 5th A.H.) comments on the point at issue as follows:

> The ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah say takwīn is the action of the Mukawwin (The Inventor) and the Mukawwan (the invented) is the effect of the takwīn, and so, takwīn is other than the mukawwan... According to the others, when the Inventor has invented a thing, the action then departs from the Inventor and it settles with the invented and the object. But the Sunnīs believe that action does not depart from the subject to settle with the object and takwīn does not depart from the Mukawwin (The Inventor).[2]

This statement clarifies how al-Bukhārī and the Māturīdīs believe in the Attribute of takwīn as an Independent Essential Attribute so they believe in eight, whereas the Ashʿarīs believe in only seven; although some of the Ashʿarīs add baqā (Permanence) also as an Essential Attribute.[3]

However al-Bukhārī agrees with the Ḥanafīs on this point and accepts takwīn as an Essential Attribute of God. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (852 A.H.) admits[4] that al-Bukhārī agrees with the Ḥanafīs on the point of takwīn whereas the Ashʿarīs do not accept it as an Essential Attribute. Al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) also establishes that God has Eight Attributes and states takwīn as one of them.[5]

1. S 36:82. Al-Kulaynī mentions takwīn in the same sequence after Irādah, and this obtains the approval of Imām ʿAlī b. Mūsā al-Riḍā (203 A.H.). See, op.cit., v.1, p.107.
2. Al-Sālimī, op.cit., pp.55-6.
3. Abū al-Thanā al-Isfahānī (749 A.H.) says, 'Apart from Life, Knowledge, Power, Intention, Hearing, Seeing and Speaking there is no other Attribute of God; or else there are Eight, these Seven and Al-Baqā. Al-Ashʿarī has also admitted some Qualities of God as His Attributes. He admits istiwā (His being on His Throne) as His Attribute. His Hand is an Attribute other than (His) Power and Face is an Attribute apart from His Being and the Eye is another Attribute, since the apparent nuṣūṣ (clear-cut verdicts) have mentioned them.'
   Abū al-Thanā, Maṭāliʿ, p.184.
4. Al-ʿAsqalānī, op.cit., v.13, p.376 (ed. Cairo, 1348 A.H.).
5. Al-Taftāzānī, op.cit., p.96.

(b) The Kalām (Speech) of God.

According to the Sunnī doctrine, God speaks with a kind of Speech which is one of His Essential Attributes, from all eternity, not of the genus of letters and sounds. God speaks with this Attribute, commanding, prohibiting and narrating, and it is an Attribute incompatible with silence and defect.

Al-Bukhārī lays stress on his refutation of the doctrine of the Muʿtazilīs, who believe that the kalām of God (the Qurʾān) is created, and he then hints at the Ḥanbalī doctrine which does not allow one to say that the reading of the Qurʾān and men's speaking it is created. It is only out of respect for the Qurʾān that they, the traditionists, do not trace this expression back to the Companions. But al-Bukhārī does not agree with them on this point and points out that the kalām of God as related to Him is not created, but when it is related to human beings and recited by them, then their speaking it is created.[1] Al-Bukhārī states these two issues by which he refutes the Muʿtazilīs' as well as the Shīʿīs' doctrine and rejects the Ḥanbalī view, as follows:

i. So the Lord with His Attributes, His Action, His Command and His Speech is the Creator and is the Inventor and not the created one.

ii. And what occurs by His Action, His Command, His Creation and His Invention is what is made, created and invented.[2]

The chapter preceding this chapter in Al-Ṣaḥīḥ as well as the following chapter holds that the Speech of God is not created. This indicates that he lays more emphasis on the first issue than on the second one. The tradition given in the preceding chapter reports the statement of a Jewish doctor that God on the Last Day will hold all the things on His Fingers and then He will say, 'I am the King'. This

1. Al-Bukhārī faced many troubles and severe opposition for this expression of his and the sad incident of how he was cross-examined on this issue in Nishabur bears testimony to this.

2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.165.

report obtained the Prophet's agreement. Isḥāq b. Rāhwayh (238 A.H.), the teacher of al-Bukhārī, says:

> It is rightly proved that God will say it after the complete destruction of His creatures.[1]

Al-Bukhārī suggests by this report of his in the preceding chapter that (when all the creation is destroyed) His kalām is Everlasting, and that it is not created. Al-ʿAynī comments:

> This is refutation of those who believe that God creates speech.[2]

Al-Bukhārī uses the following verse of the Qur'ān as his next Chapter-heading:

> And certainly Our word has already gone forth in respect of Our servants, the Apostles.[3]

Then al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as saying:

> When God decided to bring the creation into being He inscribed in His presence above the Throne, 'My Mercy has preceded my anger.'[4]

Al-Bukhārī in another Chapter clearly states that it was written in His Book (The Preserved Tablet) with Him on the Throne before bringing the creation into being.[5] Al-Bukhārī concludes from the above-quoted tradition that His kalām is above His creation and that it is His Ṣifah (The Attribute). He writes:

> The Qur'ān is an Attribute from among His Attributes.[6]

Al-Bukhārī also states that His kalimāt (words) are unlimited and countless whereas the created ones are limited and subject to being counted. He uses the following verses of the Qur'ān as a Chapter-heading:[7]

1. Al-ʿAynī, op.cit., v.11, p.521.
2. ibid, v.11, p.521.
3. S 37:171.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.165.
5. ibid, v.4, p.129.
6. ibid, v.9, p.151.
7. ibid, v.9, p.167.

> Say. If the Ocean were ink for the Words of my Lord, the Ocean would surely be consumed before the Words of my Lord are exhausted, though we add another Ocean like it for its aid.[1] And if all the trees on earth were pens and the Ocean (were ink) with seven more oceans to increase it, 'the words of God' will not come to an end; for God is Mighty, Wise....[2]

Al-Bukhārī argues by this expression of 'the words of God' that they are not created and that they are subsisting in Him.

Al-Bukhārī lays down another Chapter-heading and reports that God speaks with a voice, though it is above the modes of the voice of the created ones. Again he uses portions of the verses of the Qur'ān as his Chapter-heading and states:

> The Word of God "No intercession can avail in His Presence save for those for whom He has granted permission; until when terror is removed from their hearts, they shall say, 'What is it that your Lord said?' They will say, 'The Truth'; and He is the Most High, the Most Great."[3] The Qur'ān does not say, "What is it that Your Lord created?" And God, Whose Eminence is Exalted, says, "Who is he that can intercede with him but by His permission?"[4] and Masrūq (63 A.H.) reports Ibn Mas'ūd, the Companion (32 A.H.) as saying, "When God speaks with <u>Waḥy</u> (revelation) the people of the heavens hear something; when terror is removed from their hearts and the Voice settles, they recognise that it is from God; and they ask (each other) "What did your Lord say?" ; they answer, "The Truth". And it is reported from Jābir, through 'Abd Allāh b. Unays, that he heard the Prophet saying:
>
> > When God will assemble the people He shall call them with a voice which the remote and the near will hear equally,[5] 'I am the King, I am the Judge.'[6]

1. <u>S</u> 18:109.
2. <u>S</u> 31:27.
3. <u>S</u> 34:23.
4. <u>S</u> 2:255.
5. This report indicates that His voice is not like the voice of the created ones. Al-Kulaynī also reports 'Alī, the Commander of the Faithful, as saying that He is the Near in His remoteness and the Remote in His nearness (<u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.86).
6. Al-Bukhārī, <u>op.cit</u>.,v.9, p.172. This report of Jābir is a part of the Chapter-heading and not a regularly transmitted tradition. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (240 A.H.) transmits it and provides a complete chain to it. (See, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, <u>op.cit</u>., v.3, p.495. We find a similar report in Al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.8, p.104., that the near and the remote will hear equally.)

Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> When God decrees a thing in the heavens, the angels being submissive to His Word flutter their wings as if it was a chain falling upon a throne; the order relates to them. When terror is removed from their hearts, they ask (each other) what their Lord said. They will answer, 'The Truth; and He is the Most High, the Most Great.'[1]

Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.), also reports the Prophet as saying:

> God will say, 'O Adam'; he will say, 'Here am I at Your Service.' Then it will be proclaimed with a voice 'God commands you to select a group from the people of your family to consign them to hell.'[2]

Al-Bukhārī, by these reports, provides evidence that, when the complete destruction of the creation shall have occurred, the Speech of God will be continuing and that the Word of God is Everlasting and not created. He also suggests that God has a voice which is above the modes of the voice of the created ones.

Al-Bukhārī reports another tradition by which it is argued that the Word of God is an Attribute of His and not created. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), reports that the Prophet sought refuge for al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn (by the Words of God) and said that their father Ibrāhīm sought refuge (by them) for Ismāʿīl and Isḥāq. The Words are the following:

> I seek refuge in God's Perfect Words from every devil and from hāmah[3] and from every evil eye.[4]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, pp.172-3.
2. ibid, v.9, p.173.
3. The word means an owl, or a night-bird which frequents graves. The pre-Islāmic Arabs believed that when vengeance had not been taken for one who had been killed a bird called hāma came forth from the dead and screeched demanding vengeance. (Dr.James Robson, Mishkāt (Translation), v.3, p.955). The Prophet had rejected this superstition. (See, Al-Bukhārī op.cit., v.7, p.175).
4. ibid, v.4, p.179.

Al-Khaṭṭābī (388 A.H.) comments upon this tradition as follows:

> Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal argues by the saying of the Prophet 'With Perfect Words of God' that the Qur'ān is not created, because the Prophet cannot seek refuge in what is created, and ~~that~~ there is nothing created but that there is a drawback in it, and something which is qualified as being Perfect cannot be created.[1]

Al-Ashʿarī (324 A.H.) also refers to these Perfect Words of God in this context.[2] Mālik the Imām (179 A.H.) reports Kaʿb al-Aḥbār, the Scholar Companion from among the people of the Book, as establishing the Perfect Words of God as ~~to~~ being equivalent to His Face and to the most Excellent Names of God:

> I seek refuge in God's Magnificent Face than Which nothing is more magnificent, in God's Perfect Words Which no one whether pious or profligate, can go beyond, in God's most Excellent Names, those which I know and those which I do not know, from the evil of what He has created, produced and brought into being.[3]

(c) The Mashī'ah (Good Pleasure) and Irādah (Intention) of God.

Al-Bukhārī discusses Mashī'ah and Irādah in a separate chapter. He lays down the following Chapter-heading on this issue:[4]

> The Chapter regarding Mashī'ah and Irādah; 'And you shall not be pleased (with a matter) except that God is pleased';[5] the Word of God, 'You give the Kingdom to whomsoever you please';[6] And you do not say of anything 'I shall do it tomorrow' except that God pleases';[7] 'Surely you cannot guide anyone whom you please but God guides those whom He pleases.'[8] Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab, the Successor (93 A.H.), reports from his father that it (this verse) was revealed in regard to Abū Ṭālib;

1. Al-Khaṭṭābī, Maʿālim al-Sunan, v.4, p.333.
2. Al-Ashʿarī, Kitāb al-Ibānah, p.42.
3. Mālik, op.cit., v.2, p.234.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.168. 5. S 81:29.
6. S 3:25. 7. S 18:23.
8. S 28:56.

> 'And He intends ease for you and does not intend to put you in difficulty.'[1]

Al-Bukhārī then transmits seventeen traditions in this Chapter. We give here only three. Al-Bukhārī reports:

> ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib says that one night the Prophet came to him and Fāṭimah, his daughter, and asked why they were not praying. ʿAlī says that he said, 'Our lives are in the Hand of God; when He pleases He will raise us.' He says that the Prophet then went back and did not say anything to him in return. He further reports that he heard him (the Prophet), when he was turning back, reciting, 'And man is most of all given to contention'[2] and he was beating his thighs.[3]

Al-Bukhārī suggests by this report, that the Prophet accepted that the Mashīʾah of God has already been decreed and that it is in accordance with it (His Mashīʾah) that actions occur here in this world; but the Prophet was not pleased to give up the human action and simply refer the case to God's decree.

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion (73 A.H.), says that he heard the Prophet of God, when he was standing on his pulpit, giving the following address:

> Your remaining time in comparison to that of the nations who have passed away is merely the time between the afternoon prayer and the sunset. The Jews were given the Tawrah; they acted upon that till midday, and they became frustrated and they were given, each one, a Qīrāt.
> Then the Christians were given the Injīl (the Gospel) and they acted upon it till the afternoon prayer. Then they were frustrated; so they were given, each one, a Qīrāt. Then you have been given the Qurʾān and you would have acted upon it up to sunset; and you would have been given, each one, two Qīrāts. The Jews (will) then ask, 'O God! Why is their action the shortest and their reward the biggest?' God will say, 'Have I held back any of your reward?' They will answer in the negative and God will say, 'It is My Bounty, I give it to whomsoever I please'.[4]

1. S 2:185.
2. S 18:54.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.168.
4. ibid, v.9, p.169.

This report shows that the mashī'ah of God is unquestionable and that it controls all the actions here in this world and the rewards in the next one, the hereafter.

Once an incident occurred whereby some Muslims remained asleep and could not offer their prayer at the proper time. The Prophet then said:

> Verily God seized your souls when He pleased and He sent them back as He pleased.[1]

This tradition also tells that it is the mashī'ah of God according to which actions occur here, and this good pleasure is with the Creator and not with the created ones.

According to al-Bukhārī mashī'ah and Irādah are one; although he has quoted here three verses mentioning mashī'ah and one mentioning Irādah, in this Chapter-heading; yet the traditions given are not at variance. The Mu'tazilīs differentiate between the two and say that His Irādah is synonymous with His Happiness and His Command and His likeness and is not linked with that which is wrong. They argue in this context with the following verses of the Qur'ān:

> And God does not Yurīdu (intend) injustice for His servants.[2]
>
> God does not Yurīdu (intend) any injustice to the creatures.[3]
>
> He is not happy with unbelief in His servants.[4]
>
> Surely God does not enjoin indecency.[5]
>
> He does not like those who exceed the limits.[6]

The first verse quoted here is the only reference which mentions His Irādah but it does not specifically negate the possibility of the Irādah's being linked with that which is wrong; it merely negates God's injustice. God's Irādah (Intention) to create wrong and right, according to the

1. ibid, v.9, p.170.
2. S 40:31.
3. S 3:107.
4. S 39:7.
5. S 7:28.
6. S 7:55.

Sunnīs, does not result in His injustice. The Sunnīs assert that His Irādah and His Mashī'ah cover right and wrong in this world, and they refer to the following verses of the Qur'ān in this context:

> 'Therefore, whomsoever God intends that He should guide him aright, for him He expands his mind for Islām; and whomsoever He intends that He should cause him to err, for him He makes his mind straight and narrow as though he were ascending upwards.'[1]

> 'And if we had pleased we would certainly have given to every soul its guidance but the word from me was just: I will certainly fill hell with the Jinn and men together.'[2]

> 'And you do not please except that God pleases, the Lord of the Worlds.'[3]

ʿAlī al-Qārī states in his commentary on Abū Ḥanīfah's Fiqh al-Akhar as follows:

> The statement of the early scholars is authentically proved from the Prophet that what God pleases (Shā'a) occurs and what He does not please does not occur.... Al-Bayhaqī transmits with his chain of transmitters that the Prophet told Abū Bakr that if God had arāda (intended) that He might not be disobeyed He would not have created (anything).[4]

Ibn Hammām (861 A.M.) is not right in his assessment in Al-Musā'irah that Abū Ḥanīfah seems to have differentiated between Irādah and Mashī'ah and has established the Irādah as meaning His Happiness and His Likeness and not His Mashī'ah (good pleasure). The statement[5] of Abū Ḥanīfah to which Ibn Hammām has referred does not relate to God's Attributes. The eminent Ḥanafī Jurist Ibn Nujaym writes

1. S 6:126.
2. S 32:13.
3. S 81:29.
4. ʿAlī al-Qārī, op.cit., p.65.
5. If someone has said to his wife with the intention to divorce her 'Shi'tu talāqaki' (I am pleased with your divorce) she is divorced; and if he said with the intention to divorce her 'Aradtu' (Intended) or 'Ahbabtu' (I liked) or 'Raḍītu' (I am happy with) 'your divorce' she is not divorced' (ibid, p.64).

in Al-Bahr al-Rā'iq:

> The jurists have differentiated between mashī'ah and Irādah if they relate to the human beings; but these are synonymous in regard to the Attributes of God and the same is their literal sense.[1]

'Alī al-Qārī explains a minute difference although it cannot be established as an actual basic difference:

> Mashī'ah is from all eternity in the 'state of presence' and Irādah is linked with (His) Action in its 'state of existence.'[2]

The Shī'īs too do not differentiate between the two and mention them together. Al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, the Shī'ī jurist, corroborates the statement of 'Alī al-Qārī and explains the minute difference between the two:

> The meaning of Mashī'ah and Irādah is that when the matter is linked with the Subject it is named Mashī'ah and when it is linked with the verb it is named Irādah.[3]

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī on the points at issue.

(a) The Attribute of takwīn (Invention).

The Shī'īs accept only the Life, the Power, the Knowledge, the Hearing and the Seeing as God's Essential Attributes which are existent in His Being, but they do not accept His Kalām, Irādah and Mashī'ah as His Essential Attributes; instead they believe in them as created. As regards the Takwīn, however, al-Kulaynī apparently agrees with the approach of al-Bukhārī.

'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān reports that al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, instructed one to pray the following supplication if one was in a state of anxiety or embarrassment:

1. Ibn 'Ābidīn al-Shāmī, Radd al-Muḥtār, v.2, p.672.
2. 'Alī al-Qārī, op.cit., p.64.
3. Al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, in a footnote on Al-Kāfī, v.1, p.150.

> O Thou who are the Kā'in (Existing) before everything; and who are the Mukawwin (Inventor) of everything; and who are the Bāqī (Everlasting) after everything! Bless Muhammad and the Family of Muhammad and do unto me such and such.[1]

The Imām gives another statement:

> And He did not become Powerful after He invented (kawwana) the things nor was He weak before He invented anything.[2]

We find mention of Takwīn in the presence of al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, and he approved it.[3]

(b) The Attribute of Kalām (Speech).

Sa'd al-Khaffāf reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as instructing him:

> O Sa'd! learn the Qur'ān; for the Qur'ān will appear on the last Day with the most beautiful face the people have ever seen and there will be lines of the people, one hundred thousand and twenty lines; eighty thousand will be comprised of the followers of Muḥammad and forty thousand will be from the followers of the other Prophets. The Qur'ān will come to the lines of the Muslims in the form of a man and will salute them and they will gaze on him..., then it (the Qur'ān) will return to the form of its first creation and will ask the beholder, 'You recognise me'; and he will answer in the affirmative.[4]

This tradition bears evidence that the Qur'ān in the first form of its creation is created and is not an Essential Attribute of God. Al-Kulaynī reports Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Imām, as saying:

> Verily the Speech is a created Attribute; it is not from all eternity; there was a time when there was God, the Mighty, the Glorified, but there was no one speaking.[5]

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.560.
2. ibid, v.1, p.88.
3. ibid, v.1, p.107.
4. ibid, v.2, p.597. The Sunnīs report the lines of the people of Paradise as being one hundred and twenty (Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.498).
5. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.107.

Mūsā Kāẓim, the Seventh Imām, corroborates this statement as follows:

> Everything except Him is created. Things came into existence with His Irādah and His Mashī'ah without any speech, without any movement in Person and without any speaking of the tongue.[1]

The Shī'īs, as this tradition suggests, give a metaphorical explanation to the following verse of the Qur'ān, which apparently tells that the whole enterprise of Invention is an effect of His Speech on "kun" (Be):

> His Command, when He intends anything, is only to say to it, kun (Be), so it is brought into being.[2]

The eminent Shī'ī scholar of dogmatics, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Ḥakīm al-Ṭūsī (672 A.H.), states:

> His Extensive Divine Power suggests the existence of Kalām (Speech) and the actual speaking's being existent with Him is not acceptable to reason.[3]

Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (762 A.H.), comments:

> All the Muslims believe that God is the Speaking One; but they differ as to the meaning of this. The Mu'tazilīs say that God created the letters and voices in bodies which bear the implied meaning; and the Ash'arīs[4] say that it is He who is speaking and His speech is established with His Essence and is other than the Irādah (Intention), the Knowledge and the other Attributes known by the expressions and it is the actual speaking's being existent with Him... Al-Ṭūsī argues for the first interpretation.[5]

1. ibid, v.1, p.106.
2. S 36:82.
3. Al-Ṭūsī, Tajrīd al-I'tiqād, p.178.
4. Al-Ḥillī has not elaborated the Ash'arī doctrine. Abū al-Thanā al-Iṣfahānī (749 A.H.), who was an Ash'arī contemporary of al-Ḥillī (762 A.H.), elaborates it as follows: "Our scholars agree that His Speech does not mean the letters and the voice existent in His Being, because the letters and the voices are created and it is impossible that the created ones be established with Him; but the Hanbalīs and the Karrāmīs say that God 'the Speaking' means that He caused the letters and the voices meaning the implied sense". (Abū al-Thanā, op.cit., p.183). Al-Ash'arī says: "The Qur'ān is The Speech of God, the uncreated. There is some dispute over waqf (punctuation) and lafẓ (pronunciation), on both sides of which (dispute) there are elements of innovation. It should not be said that (our) pronunciation of the Qur'ān is created nor that it is uncreated. (Ash'arī, Maqālāt, v.1, p.292).
5. Al-Ḥillī, Kashf al-Murād, p.178.

In spite of this, the Shīʿīs believe in the incomparability of the Qurʾān and claim that no one can compose such a speech. Muḥammad b. Murtaḍā Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (1091 A.H.) writes:

> The Qurʾān is the Truth, the Speech of God, His Revelation and His Book .... Verily God is the Creator of it, its Revealer, its Lord, its Preserver and it is Guardian over all the Books; and it is the Truth from its beginning to its end... And no one of the created ones can provide a book like this.[1]

(c) The Attributes of Mashīʾah (Good Pleasure) and Irādah (Intention)

Al-Kulaynī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

> The Irādah (Intention) is an Attribute of (His) Action; and there are other Attributes of (His) Action.

He, then, reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> Verily one cannot be 'the intending' unless 'the intended one' is with him. God has been the Knowing, the Powerful, from all eternity, and then He intended (arāda).[2]

The Imām suggests that He is not 'the Intending' from all eternity but from the time when things (intended) occurred. The Imām further states: "God created Mashīʾah (Good Pleasure) and then, by His Mashīʾah, He created all the things." "The Mashīʾah is 'the created one'".[3]
These reports provide ample evidence that the Shīʿīs regard God's Attribute of His being 'the Intending' as a 'created one', even as they regard His being 'the Speaking', as a created matter of His Being. Al-Kulaynī lays down another Chapter-heading for the Mashīʾah and the Irādah. He reports Mūsā Kāẓim, the Seventh Imām, as giving a sequence for God's Actions:

> Nothing can occur unless God pleases, intends, decrees and decides.

1. Al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī, Minhāj al-Nijāt, p.279.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.109.
3. ibid, v.1, p.110.

The companion ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm asked for the meanings of these words: the good pleasure, the decree and the decision. The Imām then answered:

> Good pleasure is the beginning of an action; decree is the evolution of the length and breadth of a thing; and decision is its enforcement and that is inevitable.[1]

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, differentiates between His Command and His Intention as follows:

> God can command without being well-pleased. He can be well-pleased without commanding. He commanded Iblīs (Satan) to prostrate before Ādam and it was not a question of God's good pleasure; and He prohibited Ādam to taste from the tree but was well-pleased in his tasting therefrom and if He had not been well-pleased he would not have so tasted.[2]

The Imām further states:

> God is well-pleased and intends; yet He may not find it to His liking and may not be happy. He is well-pleased and intends that there should not happen anything apart from His Knowledge; but He does not find it to His liking that God should be proclaimed One of Three and He is not happy with the disbelief of His servants.[3]

This report clearly states that His Good Pleasure and Intention is above His liking and His being Happy with a matter; and in this explanation of his al-Kulaynī disagrees with the Muʿtazilīs and agrees with the Sunnīs.

7. The doctrine of the Vision of God in the Hereafter.

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī:

Al-Bukhārī uses the following verse of the Qur'ān as a Chapter-heading and asserts that the believers would be looking towards their Lord in the hereafter:

1. ibid, v.1, p.150.
2. ibid, v.1, p.151.

3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, pp.151-2.

> Some faces on that Day shall be bright looking towards their Lord.[1]

Al-Bukhārī's selection of this verse of the Qur'ān as a Chapter-heading points to a tradition which he himself has not transmitted as the chain of the transmitters did not fulfil al-Bukhārī's conditions. ʿAbd Allāh b. 'Umar, the Companion (73 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> The lowest in rank among the people of Paradise will be the one who will look at his gardens, his wives, his bliss, his servants and his couches stretching a thousand years' journey; and the one who will be most honoured by God will be one who will look at His Face morning and evening. Then the Prophet recited: 'Some faces on that Day shall be bright, looking towards their Lord.'[2]

Al-Bukhārī reports Jarīr b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion (51 A.H.), as saying that they were sitting with the Prophet and he looked towards The Moon on the fourteenth night and said:

1. S.75:22

2. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, pp.90-91. Mālik, the Imām (179 A.H.), was told that some people (the Muʿtazilīs and the Shīʿis) said that this verse meant the reward of their Lord. Mālik said, 'They lie. How do they explain His word. Nay! Most surely they shall on that Day be veiled from their Lord (S83:15)". Mālik said men would look at their Lord with their eyes. If the believers were not to look at their Lord God would not have reproached the non-believers with being veiled on that Day (See, al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.502.

> You will see your Lord as you see this Moon; you have no doubts in regard to its vision; so if you can save yourselves from being prevented from the prayer before the sun-rise and the prayer before the sun-set do so.[1]

Jarīr further reports the Prophet as saying:

> You will have ocular vision of your Lord.[2]

Al-Bukhārī reports the tradition of intercession that when all the Prophets would say that they were not in a position to intercede for them the people would come to the Prophet and he would then say:

> They will come to me and I shall seek permission from my Lord Who will be in His House. I will be permitted to enter unto His Presence; when I see Him I shall fall in prostration (unto Him).[3]

ʿAdī b. Ḥātim, the Companion (67 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> God will speak to everyone of you. There will not be any interpreter between Him and him, nor any veil which can debar him.[4]

ʿAbd Allāh b. Qays reports his father as reporting from the Prophet:

> There will be two gardens (in Paradise), the vessels and all the contents of one will be of silver and those of the other will be of gold; there will not be any veil between the people and their looking at their Lord but a veil of Greatness on His Face in Eden's Paradise.[5]

The Light of His Greatness is depicted in the following tradition. Abū Dharr, the Companion (32 A.H.), reports that he asked the Prophet whether he had seen his Lord. The Prophet said:

> His is Light; how can I see Him.[6]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.156.
2. ibid, v.9, p.156.
3. ibid, v.9, p.161.
4. ibid, v.9, p.162.
5. ibid, v.9, p.162.
6. Muslim, op.cit., v.1, p.111.

This tradition does not reject the doctrine of God's vision in the Hereafter; it negates His vision only in this world; and the Ashʿarīs also do not agree with God's vision in this mortal life. Al-Ashʿarī says:

> God will create in the Hereafter a sixth sense by which we see His Person.[1]

As regards the Vision of God in the Hereafter there is no dispute in the Sunnī schools of dogmatics. The traditionists lay down Chapter-headings on this issue and report traditions on it. Laqīṭ b. ʿĀmir Abū Razīn al- ʿUqaylī, the Companion, reports that he asked the Prophet, 'Will each of us see His Lord, being alone with Him, on the Last Day?' The Prophet answered in the affirmative. Abū Razīn then asked what sign of this was here in His creation? The Prophet replied:

> Does not each one of you see the moon in the night when it is full, being alone with it? This is only a part of God's creation; but God is more Glorious and Great.[2]

Al-Tirmidhī (279 A.H.) also lays down a separate Chapter-heading[3] on the vision of God and corroborates the Sunnī approach on the issue. Ibn Mājah (273 A.H.) transmits from Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion (74 A.H.), as reporting from the Prophet:

> While the people of Paradise are in their bliss a Light will shine out to them, and raising their heads they will see that their Lord is looking at them from above. He will then say: 'Peace be to you, O people of Paradise!' The word of God is the proof of that: 'Peace: a word from the Merciful Lord.'[4] He will then look at them and they will look at Him; and they will not turn aside to any form of the bliss as long as they are looking at Him till He veils Himself from them although there remains His Light and His blessing upon them in their places.[5]

1. Al-Ashʿarī, op.cit., v.1, p.154.
2. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.501 (with reference to Abū Dā'ūd).
3. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.90.
4. S 36:58.
5. Ibn Mājah, op.cit., v.1, p.41.

These reports provide ample evidence that, according to the Sunnī traditionists, the doctrine of God's vision in the Hereafter is a verity. Al-Ashʿarī attacks the Muʿtazilīs and accuses them of having gone against the reported arguments. He writes:

> They went against the traditions of the Companions who report from the Prophet of God the vision of God with the eyes. Traditions from different contexts have been received on this issue and the reports have attained celebrity and these tidings agree with each other.[1]

It is correct that He will be looked upon in the Hereafter in the meaning that He will manifest Himself for His servants, the believers, in the Hereafter with a manifestation as that of the Moon which is seen; and this view is against that of the Muʿtazilīs; and this vision will be without irtisām (marking), or ittiṣāl (uniting) of the ray of sight with Him and without any dimension of direction; and this view is over against the doctrine of the Mushabbihah and the Karrāmiyah.[2]

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī.

Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the Eleventh Imām (260 A.H.), was a contemporary of al-Bukhārī (256 A.H.). Yaʿqūb b. Iṣḥāq wrote to the Imām as to how he should worship his Lord when he was not seeing Him. The Imām wrote in his answer:

> O Abū Yūsuf my Master and my Lord and my and my father's Benefactor is above seeing.

He then asked the Imām whether the Prophet saw his Lord? The Imām wrote in answer:

> Verily God, the Blessed and the Exalted, caused his Prophet to see by his heart the Light of His Magnificence as He liked.[3]

1. Al-Ashʿarī, Kitāb al-Ibānah, p.5.
2. Al-Bayḍāwī, op.cit., p.185.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.95.

ʿAbū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Naqī, the Tenth Imām (254 A.H.), who was also a contemporary of al-Bukhārī (256 A.H.), wrote to Aḥmad b. Isḥāq as follows:

> Visions cannot occur unless between the Seeing and the one who is seen there is atmosphere through which the sight goes. When atmosphere is removed from the seeing and the one who is seen vision is not true and there occurs doubt; for if the seeing, due to the source (atmosphere) causing the vision between the two, keeps separate from the one which is seen then there occurs doubt and it amounts to tashbīh (anthropomorphism); for it is necessary for the sources to have been linked with the causers.[1]

Abū Qurrah, the traditionist, once told al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, that the Sunnīs report that God had divided Vision and Speaking between two Prophets; He bestowed His Speech upon Mūsā and caused Vision for Muḥammad. The Imām asked:

> Who is then The Conveyor from God to the Jinn and mankind, the two weighty things: 'The eyes cannot take hold of Him',[2] and 'They do not comprehend Him in knowledge',[3] and 'no one is like Him?'[4] Is it not Muḥammad?

Abū Qurrah answered in the affirmative. The Imām then asked:

> How can a man come to all mankind and tell them that he has come from God and that he, by His Command, is calling them to Him and how can he quote: 'The eyes cannot take hold of Him' and 'They do not comprehend Him in knowledge', and he himself be in the form of a human being?

Abū Qurrah then asked the Imām: 'Do you reject the traditions?' The Imām then answered:

1. ibid, v.1, p.97.
2. S 6:104.
3. S 20:110.
4. S 42:11.

> If the traditions oppose the Qur'ān I shall reject them; and all the Muslims agree that He cannot be comprehended in knowledge and the eyes cannot take hold of Him and no one is equal to Him.[1]

This tradition shows how the Shī'īs and the Sunnīs are at variance on this issue. Al-Kulaynī has reported this tradition under the Chapter-heading: 'In rejection of the Vision'[2], and then he lays down another chapter using the following verse of the Qur'ān as its heading:

> The eyes cannot take hold of Him and He takes hold of the eyes.[3]

This suggests how strongly he holds and supports this opinion.

The Sunnīs and the Shī'īs agree that God's <u>Dhāt</u> has Names (<u>Asmā'</u>), Attributes (<u>Ṣifāt</u>) and Qualities (<u>Nu'ūt</u>). They differ from each other in the relationship of His <u>Dhāt</u> to His Names and Attributes. Al-Bukhārī allows no demarcation between the <u>Dhāt</u> of God, 'The Named', and His Names, whereas al-Kulaynī describes God's Names as being other than He. The Sunnīs believe the Attributes of God not to be exactly He nor other than He and leave the interpretation of the Attributes to God Himself. The Shī'īs believe God's Essential Attributes (<u>Ṣifāt al-Dhāt</u>) to be not other than He and do not accept the words mentioning His Attributes in a literal sense. They regard the other Attributes of God (<u>Ṣifāt al-Fi'l</u>) to be other than He and consider it necessary to negate them from His <u>Dhāt</u>. The Shī'īs mostly mean by <u>Ṣifāt</u> this second category.

In the main these differences are no more than verbal differences. The actual disagreement between the Sunnīs and the Shī'īs lies in the explanation of the <u>Nu'ūt</u> of God. The Sunnī traditionists hold a distinct position accepting the applications of the words likely to suggest any anthropomorphic ideas but they do not give them any interpretation

1. Al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit.</u>, v.1, p.96.
2. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.97.
3. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.98.

believing their meaning to be well known to God. They add however that what is known is that the Nuʿūt do not bear any resemblance with created things. But the Shīʿīs give these Ṣifāt and Nuʿūt literal explanations.

A real and open confrontation has developed between the Sunnīs and Shīʿīs in regard to the Attributes of Kalām (Speech) and Ruʾyah (Vision) in the hereafter. The Sunnīs believe that the Word of God (the Qurʾān) is not created whereas the Shīʿīs hold it to be created. As to the Vision of God the Sunnīs believe that the believers would be looking towards their Lord in the hereafter whereas the Shīʿīs stress that the eyes cannot take hold of Him, rejecting the reports mentioning the Vision of God in the hereafter. These are the main differences in this whole area between the Sunnīs and Shīʿīs regarding the Names and Attributes of God.

In the Next chapter the Second basic doctrine of Islām is discussed; i the Apostleship of God. It is the Apostleship by which mankind can realize what pleases or displeases God.

Chapter III. THE APOSTLESHIP OF GOD.

1. The question as to whether Apostleship is a benefit of God or whether there is an obligation on the part of God to send His Apostles.

The Muʿtazilīs, as well as the Shīʿīs, believe that it is an obligation on the part of God to send His Apostles whereas the Sunnīs believe that nothing is obligatory for God and that it is a benefit conferred by God that He has at various times sent His Apostles to guide humanity. The eminent Shīʿī scholastic theologian Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (762 A.H.) writes:

> The people differ on this issue; the Muʿtazilīs say that biʿthah (raising the Apostles) is wājib (obligatory) and the Ashʿarīs say that it is not wājib. The Muʿtazilīs argue that requirements based on reports are simply benefits, secondary to the requirements based on reason; and it is obligatory for God to be affectionate. So it is wājib to bind (the human beings) by (Divine) communications which are not possible except through the Apostles; so it is necessary that the Apostles should be available.[1]

Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, the influential Sunnī scholar of the eighth century A.H.) states the Ashʿarī doctrine as follows:

> Nothing is an obligation for God.... The creatures are His creation; and the world is in His possession; and His order is the (enforcing) command; so it is for Him to treat human beings how He wishes.[2]

Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, the Sunnī traditionist and scholastic theologian (1014 A.H.), comments on an argument of al-Ghazālī as follows:

> It is not obligatory on the part of God to do (always) what is the best for human beings and other creatures, contrary to the doctrine of the Muʿtazilīs. Al-Ghazālī says that there is no doubt that it was best for the human beings to have been born in Paradise. So if He creates them in this world of trials and provides them with the chance to commit mistakes and then purposes for them the risk of punishment and the fear

1. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, Kashf al-Murād, p.217.
2. Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyat al-Kubrā, v.2, p.283.

> of examination and judgement there can be no good (for human beings) in the opinion of the people of wisdom.[1]

ʿAlī al-Qārī further states:

> Verily that which is best for human beings is not an obligation for God, the Glorified; otherwise He would not have created the non-believer who is poor and the tortured one in this world and the hereafter; for it would have been better for such a one that he had not been born.[2]

Al-Majlisī, the Second (1110 A.H.), realises the need for discernment in this issue; he shows himself to be somewhat flexible but advises that one should not go too deeply into this matter. He writes:

> It is the doctrine of the majority of the Shīʿīs that it is wājib (obligatory) for God to do what is the best for the creation and the process of this world; but some scholars of dogmatics believe that it is necessary that the Action of God may be based on any considerations whatsoever and that it is not necessary that these should be the best (for anyone); and it seems that it is not necessary to go deeply into this issue.[3]

In spite of this consideration he expresses the Shīʿī doctrine as follows:

> The Shīʿīs believe that it is wājib on the part of God to send the Apostles because it is obligatory for God to benefit (the creature).[4]

Apart from this dispute the two Schools agree that it is wājib for humanity to recognise their Lord; but they differ as to whether this necessity is based on Divine report or whether it is based on reason. The Sunnīs support the former whereas the Shīʿīs favour the latter. We shall discuss this later on;[5] but here we point out that the doctrine of the Shīʿīs is an outcome of their fundamental doctrine that it is wājib on the part of God to send His Apostles. According to their Faith it is reason which establishes this

1. Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar, p.154.
2. ibid, p.155.
3. Al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.10.
4. ibid, p.10.
5. See , p.113.

as wājib; reason links human beings with God and the Apostles then set the human beings on the right path.

Before we discuss how al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī approach these issues it is appropriate to give a Qur'ānic explanation:

> Certainly God conferred a benefit upon the believers when He raised among them an Apostle from among themselves, reciting to them His verses and purifying them and teaching them the Book and the wisdom. Verily they were before in a manifest error.[1]

> They think that they lay you under an obligation that they embraced Islām. Say lay me not under obligation by your Islām; rather God lays you down under an obligation by guiding you to the Faith if you are truthful.[2]

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach on the point at issue.

Al-Bukhārī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

> And certainly Our Word has already gone forth in respect of Our servants, the Apostles.[3]

Al-Bukhārī suggests this Qur'ānic revelation as the basis of Apostleship and under this Chapter-heading he reports the Prophet as saying:

> When God created the creation He wrote with Him (i.e. on the Prescribed Tablet) that His Mercy precedes His anger.[4]

Al-Bukhārī suggests that creation is a mercy of God and a benefit of His which He has conferred upon His creatures along with the sending of His Apostles and that He has laid down His Mercy as being the basis of His Apostleship. Al-Bayhaqī (458 A.H.) corroborates this statement that Apostleship itself is a mercy extending to include the period of the true succession. Abū ʿUbaydah and Muʿādh b. Jabal, the Companions (18 A.H. and 18 A.H.), report the Prophet as saying:

> This matter began as prophecy and mercy; then it will become a Caliphate and mercy, and then a tyrannical kingdom.[5]

1. S 3:163. 2. S 49:17. 3. S 37:171.
4. Al-Bukhārī, Al-Saḥīḥ, v.9, p.165.
5. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ, p.460

Al-Bukhārī does not object to the word ḥaqq in respect of God so long as it simply suggests the way in which God in any case always acts, and so long as it does not necessarily mean that it is binding upon Him, and so long as it suggests that He has ordained mercy on Himself and that there is no authority over Him. Muʿādh, the Companion (18 A.H.), reports that he was riding behind the Prophet when the latter asked:

> Do you know Muʿādh? What is the due of God from His servants? (Again he asked) What is the due of His servants from Him when they act (upon His Commands)?

Muʿādh said in answer to both questions that God and His Prophet knew best. The Prophet then said:

> The due which God may expect from His servants is that they should worship Him, not associating anything with Him, and the due (ḥaqq) which the servants may expect from Him is that He may not punish them (if they do not associate anything with Him).1

Ḥaqq does not mean here that it is an obligation and binding on the part of God to admit them to Paradise, but that it is due to His merciful treatment of His servants that He rewards them in Paradise. Al-Bukhārī explains this in another chapter and reports the Prophet as saying:

> Paradise and hell had a dispute which they referred to their Lord. Paradise asked her Lord what was the matter with her that only weak and lowly people entered therein? And hell said that she was distinguished by the proud ones. God, the Exalted, then said to Paradise, 'You are my mercy' and He said to hell, 'You are my punishment by which I punish those whom I wish; and both of you will be full.' As regards Paradise (so this is that) God does not do injustice to any of His creatures; and He creates for hell whom He wishes, and they are thrown therein.2

This report suggests that Paradise is God's benefit and His mercy which He confers upon whomsoever He wishes; and it is not wājib upon Him to admit the believers to His Paradise

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.7, p.218; v.4, p.35; v.8, p.74; p.130. Muslim, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, v.9, p.140.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.164.

but it is a mercy and favour which He has promised to give in reward and in recognition of His servants' service to Him. Al-Bukhārī has given the following Chapter-heading to this tradition:

> Surely the mercy of God is nigh to those who do good.[1]

This report and this Chapter-heading explicitly state what is the purported meaning of ḥaqq in the report of Muʿādh.

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) gives a very good comprehensive explanation of this:

> Ḥaqq means everything which exists or will surely occur. So God is the Ḥaqq, the Existing, the One from all Eternity, the Remaining, the Ever-lasting; and death, the Last Hour, Paradise and hell are ḥaqq as they certainly occur; and when it is remarked that a certain speech is ḥaqq it means that the report is true. In the same way the due which is established from the other one and in which there is no doubt is called ḥaqq.... The due of the servants from Him means that it will certainly happen. Some say that this use of the word (ḥaqq) is only by use of analogy and that is also possible to explain it as when someone says to his companion, 'Your due is established from me' meaning 'I shall certainly do that.' There is the saying of the Prophet that it is an established due for every Muslim to have a bath every week.[2]

This explains that ḥaqq in the report of Muʿādh does not necessarily mean that it is an obligation binding on the part of God to admit His servants to Paradise. The Qurʾānic use of this word: 'And helping the believers is ever ḥaqq on Us.'[3] has explicitly been explained in another verse of the Qurʾān as follows:

> Your Lord has ordained mercy on Himself, so that if anyone of you does evil in ignorance, then turns after that and acts aright, then He is the Forgiving, the Merciful.[4]

1. S 7:56.
2. Al-Nawawī, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, v.1, p.44.
3. S 30:47.
4. S 6:54. The same sense is depicted in a Ḥadīth Qudsī that God says: 'O my servants I have made it forbidden for me to do any ẓulm (injustice).... These are your actions which I record for you and then I reward you for them; so one who finds the good (reward) should praise God and one who finds the reward other than that may not curse anyone but himself. (Muslim, op.cit., v.8, p.17).

This bears evidence that when God says that He would certainly do that and expresses this treatment of His as ḥaqq it does not mean that it is an obligation binding on Him. The Muʿtazilīs accept this word in its apparent meaning and establish what is best for His creatures as being an obligation and incumbent on Him. Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (of the eighth century A.H.) attacks the doctrine of the Muʿtazilīs and supports the Sunnī doctrine as follows:

> The Muʿtazilāh believe that it is wājib on God to reward those who are obedient to Him and it is also wājib on Him to punish the sinners; so the submission of the worshippers is the cause of their having a due to a reward for it and the failings of the sinners are the cause of their having a due to punishment for them. The Sunnīs among the Ashāʿrāh and all those who oppose the Muʿtazilāh say that there is nothing obligatory on God.... The worshippers will certainly have a reward for their worship but it is a benefit of God and it is not that they have any due from Him. Their prayers are indications (of the fact that they would be rewarded) and not the causes and reasons (for establishing it as wājib).[1]

Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.) reports Ubayy b. Kaʿb, the Companion (19 A.H.), as saying:

> Were God to punish everyone in the heavens and the earth He would do so without being unjust to them, and were He to show mercy to them His mercy would be much better than their actions merited.[2]

The Sunnīs believe that it is the favour of God if He benefits anyone and if He confers His favour upon anyone that is because He so wishes. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr, the Companion, (67 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> God created His creature in darkness and cast some of His Light upon them. Those on whom some of that Light falls are rightly guided and those who are missed by it will go astray.[3]

If it had been necessary for God to do what was the best for all human beings no one would have missed that Light.

1. Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, op.cit., v.2, p.283.
2. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, v.5, p.182.
3. Al-Tirmidhī, Sunan, v.2, p.107.

ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach on the point at issue.

The Shīʿīs do not object to the wide application of the word ḥaqq[1] but as regards the basic doctrine they side with the Muʿtazilīs and believe that it is an obligation on the part of God to send His Apostles. Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> It is not necessary for the creatures to know God; and it is for God to make Himself known, and when God makes Himself known it is for the creature to recognise Him.[2]

This basic belief led al-Kulaynī to assert that the Apostleship or its Divine succession is always existent in this world and it is impossible that mankind should be completely lacking the Divine guide in human form; otherwise it would involve veiling the doctrine of establishing it as an obligation on the part of God to send His Apostles. Al-Kulaynī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

'The earth cannot be exempt from the Divine Authority'. Al-Kulaynī then reports ʿAlī, the First Imām, as saying in supplication to God:

> O God! Verily You do not exempt the earth from Your Divine Authority over Your creature.[3]

1. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (404 A.H.) reports an address of ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as follows: 'Certainly God has established my due upon you for the charge of your affair (in my hand) and your due is also established on me as mine is established upon you; so ḥaqq (due) is the widest thing in its attributes and the most straightened in its applications. It does not give anything but requires from him something, and does not expect (anything) from anyone but gives something to him. If it had been right for anyone to give only and not to require anything from anyone it would have been for God alone but not for His creature, since His Power is over His servants and His justice applies in all the spheres through which His decree is enforced; but He has established His due from His servants that they should obey Him and He has ordained on Himself the double reward as a matter of benefit and prolongation and He is worthy of adding more. (Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, Nahj al-Balāghah, v.2, pp.223-4).
2. Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, v.1, p.164.
3. ibid, v.1, p.178.

Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, states:

> By God, God has never left this earth since Ādam expired without their being an Imām therein through whom guidance is sought to the Path of God; and he is His Divine Authority over His servants; and the earth is never exempt from the Imām, the Divine Authority of God over His servants.[1]

Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, corroborates this statement as follows:

> The earth has ever been having the Divine Authority from God who makes known what is the allowed and what is the forbidden; so call the people to the Path of God.[2]

This doctrine of permanent Divine Authority cannot apparently be reconciled with the period of fatrah (cessation) during which the chain of the Divine Authority stands interrupted with no Apostle to guide humanity. The Qur'ān mentions this state of fatrah as follows:

> O people of the Book! Indeed Our Apostle has come to you, after a cessation of the Apostles, explaining to you, lest you say: "There came not to us a Bearer of good news or a Warner"; so indeed there has come to you a Bearer of good news and a Warner; and God has Power over all things.[3]

Several centuries had passed since the advent of Jesus Christ, and there had appeared no Apostle until the Prophet Muḥammed. This cessation indicates that the doctrine of Permanent Divine Authority was emphasised later on. According to the report of al-Sharīf al- Raḍī, 'Alī himself believed in the cessation during which no Divine Authority of God existed. 'Alī states:

> God sent him after a cessation of the Apostles, and a long slumber of the nations.[4]

On another occasion 'Alī, in regard to the Prophet, said:

> His Sīrah (way of life) is evenness, his Sunnah (pattern) is guidance, his speech is decisive and his command is justice after a cessation of the Apostles.[5]

1. ibid, v.1, p.179. 2. ibid, v.1, p.178. 3. S 5:19.
4. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.1, p.155; v.2, pp.22, 69.
5. ibid, v.1, p.186.

ʿAlī himself believed the Apostleship of Muḥammad to be a benefit of God and a favour of His which He conferred upon human beings. ʿAlī says in one of his supplications:

> And Muḥammad has been sent by Thee as a blessing and he is Thy Apostle with ḥaqq (truth) or as (men's) due (from God) sent as a mercy.[1]

ʿAlī further states:

> So you see the occasions of God's blessings on them as He sent to them His Apostles.[2]

These reports provide sufficient evidence that ʿAlī believed that Apostleship is a benefit conferred by God on human beings and that it is not wājib (obligatory) on God to do what is the best for everyone of His creation.

Al-Kulaynī asserts that God did the best for everyone of his creatures when He suggested to them the right path and they themselves chose error above guidance. He reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as quoting the various verses of the Qur'ān and explaining them as follows:

> "And God is not one to lead a people astray after He has guided them until He has made manifest unto them what they should guard against."[3] This means until He has acknowledged to them what pleases Him and what displeases Him.
>
> "He showed the soul by inspiration its deviation from truth and its guarding (against evil)."[4] This means that God told the soul what it has to do and what it has to give up.
>
> "Surely We have shown him the way, he may be thankful or unthankful."[5] This means that we have endowed him with right knowledge; but he may grasp the opportunity or let it pass.
>
> "As to Thamūd, We showed them the right way but they chose error above guidance."[6] This means that We endowed them with right knowledge; but they chose error above guidance even though they already had knowledge.[7]

1. ibid., v.1, p.204.
2. ibid, v.2, p.179.
3. S 9:115.
4. S 91:8.
5. S 76:3.
6. S 41:17.
7. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.163.

Al-Ḥillī (762 A.H.) corroborates this doctrine as follows:

> God is compassionate to the human beings. He does what is the best for them and what is the most useful.[1]

Al-Kulaynī and al-Ḥillī do not quote any verse related to the decree whereby some people will be certainly led astray; it cannot be regarded as the best thing for them to have been born for punishment although this is not necessarily an inherently bad thing in consideration of the universal wisdom.

2. <u>The question as to whether the necessity of people's recognition of God is based on reason or on His revelation to His Apostles.</u>

i. <u>Al-Bukhārī's approach</u>.

According to the Sunnīs the status of <u>ʿaql</u> (reason) is next to the status of Divine communication, but priority rests with the Divine communication. They believe that the necessity of people's recognition of God is based on <u>Waḥy</u>, the revelation of God to His Apostles, and not on reason, as the Muʿtazilīs and the Shīʿīs do. It is true that reason suggests the Oneness of the Creator, but if someone, before having received the Divine communication, believes in the Oneness of God he does not deserve any reward for that. Similarly if someone commits unbelief in that state of cessation he does not deserve any punishment. The Sunnī scholastic theologian Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī al-Baghdādī (429 A.H.) writes:

> Our scholars say that reason suggests that the world is created, and that its Creator is One and He is Existing from all eternity and that He has Eternal Attributes; it is also permissible that He may send Apostles to His servants...; but as regards the obligatory actions and the actions to be avoided and the actions forbidden for His servants, these cannot be acknowledged but through the source of Divine communication...; and if a wise man has done anything, before the Divine communication came down to him, he does not deserve any reward or punishment (for that). If a wise man argues, before the Divine communication came down to him, that the world is created and that its Creator is One ... he is a believer, believing in the

1. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, <u>op.cit</u>., p.78.

> Oneness of God, but he does not deserve from God, the Exalted, any reward for that. So if God favours him with Paradise and its blisses it is a benefit from Him...; and if he holds unbelief and deviation before having received the Divine report he is an unbeliever and impugner but not deserving any punishment for that.... The basis of passing this judgement is that the reward results from obedience, and obedience means submission to the command; and punishment is a result of disobedience and disobedience means compromising with prohibition and opposing the command.... This is the opinion of our teacher Abū al-Hasan al-Ashʿarī in this context; and Mālik (179 A.H.), al-Shāfiʿī (204 A.H.), al-Awzāʿī (157 A.H.), al-Thawrī (161 A.H.), Abū Thawr (Ibrāhīm b. Khālid) (240 A.H.), Ahmad b. Hanbal (241 A.H.), Dāʾūd (270 A.H.), the men of apparent verdicts and al-Ḍarārīyah, all agree with this.[1]

Al-Bukhārī holds this Sunnī opinion and starts his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ with the opening chapter: 'How the revelation to the Prophet commenced'; whereas al-Kulaynī starts his Al-Kāfī with the opening chapter: 'Kitāb al-ʿaql' (the book of reason). Al-Bukhārī argues with this beginning of his that all the requirements of Religion are based on Waḥy, the revelation of God to His Apostles.

Al-Bukhārī closes his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ with the last main-heading as Kitāb al-Tawḥīd in which he refutes the doctrines of the Jahmīyah (and the Muʿtazilīs). In these chapters of his al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet and his Companions as having mentioned the Attributes of God, His Qualities and His Actions. These reports of al-Bukhārī bear evidence that he regards the necessity of people's recognition of God as being based on the Divine communication and not on reason. The Sunnīs do not allow the Nuʿūt (Qualities) of God as His Face, Hand, Eye and His istiwā, (Establishment) on His Throne to be interpreted whereas the Shīʿīs give literal interpretations to these. These variant attitudes towards the Nuʿūt of God result from this basic difference of opinions as to whether the necessity of people's recognition of God is based on reason or on the Divine communication.

Al-Bukhārī says that the first message of the Apostles is to call the people to the Oneness of God. He starts his

1. Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir, Uṣūl al-Dīn, pp.24-5.

Kitāb al-Tawḥīd with the following Chapter-heading:

> What came down in relation to how the Prophet called his people to the Oneness of God, the Blessed and the Exalted.1

ʻAbd Allāh b. ʻAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), reports that the Prophet sent Muʻādh, the Companion (18 A.H.), to Yamān and instructed him as follows:

> You are going to a community of the people of the Book, so the first thing to which you have to invite them is that they should testify 'There is no God but One God, the Exalted.' When they recognise this then tell them that God has made obligatory for them five-fold prayer during a day and night. If they offer prayer then tell them that God has made obligatory for them the giving of alms from their riches (amwāl). This should be taken from the rich and given to the poor. If they admit so then receive it from them and avoid taking the best parts of their property (amwāl).2

Al-Bukhārī suggests that, when the people of Book who had already recognised God on the basis of previous scriptures are eligible for the Prophet to call them to the Oneness of God, how then could people's recognition of God be based on reason? It is the foremost duty of the Prophet to call the people to Him and to make them admit to His Oneness and to all His Eternal Attributes.

Al-Bukhārī admits that the truth had its natural basis in the hearts of the people which the revelation developed later on but he does not admit that any responsibility for the recognition of God could be laid on this natural basis. Yet in principle he does not object to this natural basis and reports Ḥudhayfah, the Companion(35 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> Faith came down from the heavens upon the hearts of the people. The Qurʼān came; they recited it and acquired knowledge from the Sunnah.3

ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach:

Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʻfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as stating:

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.139.
2. ibid, v.9, p.140.
3. ibid, v.9, p.114.

> Verily God lays responsibility on the people for what He has given to them and for that of which He has given them knowledge.[1]

The words 'what He has given to them' require some explanation. Al-Majlisī, the Commentator of Al-Kāfī, writes:

> This covers the wisdom, the sources, the instruments, the parts of the body and the powers; and 'giving them knowledge' refers to the principles of Religion and its applications; as God says: 'Have I not given him two eyes and a tongue and two lips and pointed out to him the two conspicuous (things)?[2], [3].

Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> The origin of all things, their beginning-point, their source of strength and their foundation without which nothing is benefited, is 'Reason'; God has made it as an embellishment for the creation and as a light for them; so by 'Reason' the people have recognised their Creator and (have seen) that they are the created ones.[4]

> Verily God lays responsibility on the people for what He has given to them and for that of which He has given them knowledge; then He sent His Apostles and revealed His Book for them.[5]

Al-Majlisī supports this verdict of the Imāms as follows:

> Verily God endowed (the people) with Reason and established arguments for His Existence, His Knowledge, His Power, His Wisdom in the heavens and in men's souls; then He raised (among them) the Apostles so that they might express for the people that which their reason could not have fulfilled; and He supported them with evident miracles.[6]

This is evidence for the fact that the Shīʿīs believe that it is wājib for the human beings to acknowledge and recognise their God and that this requirement from mankind is based on Reason and not on the Apostleship which comes at a later stage.

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.163.
2. S 90:8, 9, 10.
3. Al-Majlisī, Mirʾat al-ʿUqūl fī Sharḥ Akhbār Ā l-al-Rasūl, v.1, p.119.
4. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.29.
5. ibid, v.1, p.164.
6. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1, p.122.

So, according to the Shīʿīs, it is people's duty to seek for their Apostles. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, further states:

> As for one who has not received the revelation it is his duty to seek for the Apostles. When he meets them he will know that they are the Authority and that submission to them is obligatory.[1]

This indicates that the Shīʿī doctrine that it is wājib on God to do what is best for every human being is based on the endowment of Reason and not on the provision of the apostolic message to everyone of them. As for those who are insane, an exception may be made; but this doctrine cannot apparently be reconciled with the fundamental doctrine that the earth cannot be exempt from the Divine Authority to provide all human beings with the Divine communication and it is not necessary for all people to search for the truth.

On the contrary al-Kulaynī reports a tradition that it is not for all people to recognise the truth but that it is an act of God that He makes Himself known.[2] Al-Majlisī gives various answers to this, the seventh of which is the following:

> This is based on taqīyah (pious dissimulation) as it apparently agrees with the Ashʿarīs and those who are close to them.[3]

3. The question as to whether it is obligatory for all mankind to recognise and admit the Apostles of God.

Apart from the acceptance of God's message which is received through the Prophets all of His servants are required to believe in the Apostles and this recognition and admittance of it is regarded as a part of their Faith. The Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs agree on this issue that it is obligatory for all mankind to believe in the Apostles of God. The Qurʾān states this requirement as follows:

> Therefore believe in God and His Apostle and the Light which we have revealed.[4]

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.169.
2. ibid, v.1, p.163, 164.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1, p.122.
4. S 64:8.

> O you who believe! be careful of (your duty to) God and believe in His Apostle; He will give you two portions of His mercy and make for you a light with which you will walk.[1]

> Believe therefore in God and His Apostles.[2]

i. Al-Bukhārī's evidence:

ʿUbādah b. Ṣāmit, the Companion (34 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> If anyone testifies that there is no God but One, who has no associate; that Muḥammad is His servant and His Apostle, and that Jesus is God's servant and a Spirit from Him and that Paradise and hell are a verity then God will cause him to enter Paradise.[3]

Abū Mūsā Ashʿarī, the Companion (52 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying that three categories of men will have a double reward:

> When a man trains a girl-slave of his and gives her a good training and educates her and gives her a good education, and then he sets her free and marries her, he will have a double reward; and a slave when he fears God and fulfils what is due to his patrons will have a double reward.[4]

Muslim reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> I have been commanded to fight against the people (of the Arab Peninsula) till they testify that there is none worthy of worship but God and that they believe in me and in what I have brought.[5]

We have already quoted from al-Bukhārī[6] that when the Prophet sent Muʿādh to Yaman he instructed him to call the people to the Path of God, the first message being that they should believe in One God. Al-Bukhārī transmits this message in its complete form in another chapter of his work as follows:

1. S 57:28.
2. S 4:171.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.201.
4. ibid, v.4, p.204.
5. Muslim, op.cit., v.1, p.39.
6. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.140.

> Call them to testify that there is no God but One and that I am the Apostle of God. If they obey that, tell them God has made obligatory for them five times of prayer every day and night.[1]

Abū Ḥanīfah, the Imām (150 A.H.), in Kitāb al-Waṣīyah, states the Sunnī doctrine in respect of the Apostleship as follows:

> Admittance alone is not a belief otherwise all the hypocrites would be believers. In the same way recognition alone is not a belief otherwise all the people of the Book would be the believers. God, the Exalted, says in regard to the hypocrites: 'And God bears witness that hypocrites are surely liars;'[2]; and He says in regard to the people of the Book: 'Those to whom we have given the Book recognise him as they recognise their sons.'[3, 4]

ii. Al-Kulaynī's evidence:

Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> If any group worships One God, offers regular prayers, gives regular charity, performs pilgrimage to Mecca and keeps fasting in the month of Ramaḍān, but then refuses to act upon any verdict of the Qur'ān or any command of the Prophet, or feels any resistance against his decision, then they have certainly turned into unbelievers.[5]

ʿAjalān Abū Ṣāliḥ asked the Sixth Imām to tell him the limits of Īmān (Faith) and the Imām replied:

> Testimony that there is none worthy of worship but One God; and that Muḥammad is the Apostle of God; and the admittance of all that he brought from God; and the five-times prayer; and the giving of the regular charity; and the keeping of the fast during the month of Ramaḍān; and the pilgrimage to the House; and the friendship of our friends and the enmity against our enemies; and coming in the group of the truthful.[6]

1. ibid, v.2, p.130, Muslim, op.cit., v.1, p.37.
2. S 63:1.
3. S 2:146.
4. Mullā Ḥusayn b. Iskandar, Al-Jawharat al-Munīfah, p.3.
5. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.390.
6. ibid, v.2, p.18.

Al-Kulaynī lays down the Chapter-heading: 'The Pillars of Islām' under which he has made the aforesaid report.

4. The nature of the Apostles.

From the very beginning the Oneness of God was strongly emphasized in Islām and this absolutely required mankind to avoid bestowing upon God's favourite trusted servants, the angels in the heavens and the Apostles on the earth, any of His Essential Attributes. Although the Apostles are held in high esteem and regarded as closely intimate with God, they do not depart from the essentials of the created beings and there is no provision in Islām for bringing the Creator and the created one to one and the same level. It is true that the Apostles may have the support of miracles, but the direction of such miracles is also in the Hand of the One God; it is when He pleases that He honours them with the support of miracles. The Qur'ān and the Prophet laid such stress on this point as to bring the otherwise widely differing Schools of Islām, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs, to be at one on this issue. The Qur'ān states the nature of all the Apostles as follows:

> Their Apostles said to them: 'We are nothing but bashar (human beings) like yourselves but God bestows (His) favours on whom He pleases of His servants, and it is not for us that we should bring an authority (miracle) except by God's permission; and on God should the believers depend.'[1]

> And they (the unbelievers) say: 'What is the matter with this Apostle that he eats food and goes about in the markets? Why has an angel not been sent down to him, so that he should have been a warner with him?[2]

God answers these questions as follows:

> And We have not sent before you any Apostles but they most surely ate food and went about in the markets; and We have made some of you a trial for others; will you show patience? And your Lord is Everseeing.[3]

1. S 14:11.
2. S 25:7.
3. S 25:20.

The Qur'ān states that the first of the Apostles is a bashar:

> And when your Lord said to the angels: 'verily I am going to create a bashar from dust. So when I have made him complete and breathed into him My Rūḥ (Inspiration) then fall down and make obeisance to him (Adam).'[1]

As regards the last of the Prophets the Qur'ān says:

> And say 'I am but a bashar like you; it is revealed to me that your God is the One, therefore whoever hopes to meet his Lord, he should do good deeds and must not associate anyone in worship of his Lord.'[2]

All the Apostles were men and God never sent any of His Apostles from the other sex. The Qur'ān says:

> And We sent not before you any (Apostle) but men to whom We sent revelation; so ask the people of the Dhikr (Admonition) if you do not know. And we did not give them bodies not eating food nor were they able to abide for ever.[3]

i. The doctrine of al-Bukhārī and the Sunnīs:
(a) The Prophet's own doctrine.

Al-Bukhārī reports Umm Salamah, the Mother of the Faithful, as saying that the Prophet heard some dispute at the door of his room, and that he went to them and said:

> I am only a bashar but those who have a dispute come to me (for judgement), one perhaps being more eloquent (in plea) than another; so I conclude that one is telling the truth and I decide in his favour; therefore whatever I decide in favour of anyone which by right belongs to any other Muslim that amounts to nothing but a portion of hell; so it is up to him to accept that or to give that up.[4]

Al-Bukhārī lays down the following Chapter-heading whereby he suggests that the Prophet was a man, like others in his manhood:

1. S.38:71, 72.
2. S 18:110; S 41:6.
3. S 21:7, 8.
4. Al-Bukhari, op.cit., v.9, p.89, Abū Dā'ūd, Sunan, v.2, p.584.

"The saying of one rajul (man) to another rajul (man) 'Away with you.'"
He then reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet that he said to Ibn Ṣayyād, the false-prophet:

> I have concealed something (in my mind) which I would like you to tell me.

The Prophet had concealed in his mind the verse of the Qurʾān: 'The day when the sky will bring forth dukhān (smoke) clearly visible.'[1] Ibn Ṣayyād could not say the complete word and replied that it was al-dukhkh; the Prophet then said:

> 'Away with you'.[2]

Al-Bukhārī and Muslim report ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion (32 A.H.) as reporting from the Prophet as follows:

> I am only a bashar like you, I forget as you forget; so when I forget remind me (of that); and when anyone of you is in doubt about his prayer (how many rakʿāt he has performed) he should aim at what is correct and complete his prayer in that respect, then give the salām and afterwards make two prostrations.[3]

(b) The doctrine of the Companions.

The Companions held the Prophet in high esteem and attributed every honour to him but they always believed him to be a human being upon whom God conferrred His favour.

Fuḍlah b. ʿUbaydah, Abū Burzah, the Companion (60 A.H.), states that he was present when Abū Bakr was very angry with a man who had made a wrong form of retaliation. Abū Burzah asked Abū Bakr to permit him to kill that man. The statement of Abū Burzah calmed the anger of Abū Bakr. Abū Bakr then went inside and sent a man to summon Abū Burzah

1. S 44:9.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.49.
3. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.92. According to the Muslim Faith the Prophet is never left in any forgetfulness but he is necessarily reminded to make his action correct.

and when he went to the Caliph he asked him what he had said. He replied that he had asked for permission to kill that man. Abū Bakr then asked him whether he would have done so if he had allowed him to do so. He answered in the affirmative. Abū Bakr then said:

> No by God! It is not for any bashar (human being) after Muḥammad (that one who abuses that human being should be killed).[1]

ʿĀʾishah, the Mother of the Faithful, was asked how the Prophet worked in his house. She answered:

> He was one bashar among other bashar (human beings); he searched his garments (for lice or anything else), he milked his sheep and he did his own chores.[2]

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr (67 A.H.) reports that he wrote everything he heard from the Prophet intending to learn it by heart. The others forbade him and they said:

> Do you write down everything you hear from the Prophet? But the Prophet is a bashar (human being) who speaks in anger as well as in pleasure.

He reports that he refrained from writing and mentioned that to the Prophet who, making an indication to his mouth, said:

> Do write; by God in whose Hand is my life nothing comes out of it but truth.[3]

ʿIkrimah, the Successor (107 A.H.), also states as follows:

> The Prophet died; and, verily, he was a bashar.[4]

(c) The doctrine of the eminent Sunnī scholars.

The scholastic theologians, the Jurists and the Ṣufīs all agree with the traditionists that the Apostles are human beings. Najm al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) writes:

> Verily God has sent Apostles from the bashar to the bashar, who gave good tidings and

1. Abū Daʾūd, op.cit,, v.2, p.600.
2. Al-Tirmidhī, Shamāʾil, pp.24, 25.
3. Abū Daʾūd, op.cit., v.2, p.514, al-Dārimī, Al-Sunan, v.1, p.125.
4. ibid, v.1, p.39.

> warnings and explained to men the things of the world and of the Faith of which they needed; and He has supported them with muʿjizāt (miracles) which break the order of (general) nature.[1]

He further states:

> And the Apostles among the bashar (human beings) are more excellent than the Apostles of the angels; and the Apostles of the angels are more excellent than the generality of mankind; and the generality of mankind is more excellent than the generality of the angels.[2]

The eminent Ḥanafī jurist Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, (1253 A.H.), states the division of bashar into three categories. Firstly, the high-ranking ones, like the Apostles; secondly, the middle class pious people like the Companions and other true believers; and, thirdly, the remainder of the people.[3] Ibn ʿĀbidīn further states, with reference to the Sharḥ of Al-Munyah, that the proposition of establishing the superiority of the bashar over the angels should not be discussed since there can be no clear-cut argument.[4]

Al-Shaykh Walī al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī (826 A.H.) was asked whether the acknowledgement of Muḥammad as a bashar (human being) and his being an Arab was essential for the rightfulness of the Faith? The Shaykh answered in the affirmative. He then said:

> If a man says, 'I believe in the Apostleship of Muḥammad to all the Universe but I do not know whether he was from the (category of) bashar or from the angels or from the jinn', or if he says, 'I do not know whether he was from the Arab or from the ʿAjam' then there is no doubt about his kufr (unbelief).[5]

Al-Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī, the Mujaddid (1035 A.H.), writes:

> O brother! Muḥammad in spite of so high a dignity was a bashar and marked with the mark of creation and with the mark of imkān (contingent existence).[6]

1. Al-Taftāzānī, Sharḥ al- ʿAqāʾid al-Nasafīyah, p.165.
2. ibid, p.196.
3. Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, Radd al-Muḥtār, v.1, p.492.
4. ibid, v.1, p.493.
5. Khayr al-Dīn Abū al-Barakāt Nuʿmān Āfandī, Ghālīyat al-Mawāʿiẓ, v.2, p.19.
6. Aḥmad Sirhindī, Maktūbāt, v.1, p.177, letter no.173.

> The Prophets are equal with the generality of human beings in their manhood and they are at one in their essence and nature. Superiority comes out of their perfect attributes; and one who lacks these qualities stands apart from their category.[1]
>
> When the chief Apostle says, 'I feel anger as the bashar feels anger' then what can one say of the saints? These noble persons are the same as other people in eating, drinking, living with a wife and children, and in their familiarity with them. The various associations which are the essentials of human beings do not escape them either. God, the Exalted, says in respect of the Prophets: 'And we have not made them bodies which do not eat;'[2] and the unbelievers, with their eyes on externals said, 'What is the matter with the Apostle that he eats food and goes about in the markets?'[3, 4]
>
> God urges upon His beloved Prophet to declare his manhood as He says: 'Say I am but a bashar like you'...; after his passing away from the world of elements his spiritual side superseded his manward side.[5]

These are the testimonies of the eminent Sunnī scholars of dogmatics, the jurists and the Ṣūfīs who unanimously hold that the Apostles are human beings and in no case could the Attributes of God be attributed to them.

(d) <u>The physical expression of the spiritual excellence</u>.

Al-Bukhārī does not reject the physical expressions of the spiritual manifestation of the excellence of Apostleship and the other Sunnī traditionists also corroborate this point of his. Kaʿb b. Mālik (40 A.H.) reports that when he refrained from going to Tabūk he went to the Prophet and gave his salām to him. He then reports the position of the Prophet as follows:

1. ibid, v.1, p.329, letter No.266.
2. S 21:8.
3. S 15:7.
4. Aḥmad Sirhindī, Mabdaʾ wa Maʿād, p.26-7.
5. Aḥmad Sirhindī, Maktūbāt, v.1, p.210, letter No.209.

> His face was shining with pleasure; and when he was pleased his face lit up so that it looked like a part of the moon and we were familiar with that (position of his).[1]

Al-Bukhārī further reports al-Barrā' b. ʿĀzib, the Companion (72 A.H.), who was asked whether the face of the Prophet was bright like a sword. He answered: 'No it was bright like a moon.'[2]

Al-Dārimī (255 A.H.) reports ʿAbd ullāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), as saying:

> When the Prophet spoke, something like light seemed to come out between his front teeth.[3]

Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), reports:

> I have seen nothing more beautiful than the Apostle of God, who looked as if the sun were pursuing its course in his face.[4]

The traditionists hold that long before his appearance in a human body the Prophet's soul was endowed with the excellence of Apostleship. Al-Tirmidhī reports that Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), asked the Prophet when he was assigned with the Apostleship? The Prophet answered:

> When Ādam had not yet united (his) soul and body.[5]

In spite of all these physical expressions of his body and his spiritual excellence his body had all the physical features of a human being. He felt the sun and when it was severe the Companions provided him with shelter from it.

Al-Bukhārī reports that when the Prophet migrated to Medina he made his stay with the Banū ʿAmr b. ʿAuf; and people who had not seen the Prophet before were coming to Abū Bakr and the Prophet kept silent. Al-Bukhārī reports:

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.229, al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.446.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit.4,228, al-Tirmidhī, Al-Sunan, v.2, p.286, Al-Shamā'il, p.2.
3. Al-Dārimī, op.cit., v.1, p.30, Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., p.3.
4. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., p.9.
5. Al-Tirmidhī, Al-Sunan, v.2, p.282. It finds its support in a report of al-Bazzār also. (See, Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, op.cit., p.72).

> And, when the sun reached the Prophet, Abū Bakr came and provided the Prophet with the shelter of his sheet, and the people then identified the Prophet.[1]

ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, reports:

> One night when the Prophet was praying he placed his hand on the ground and a scorpion stung him. He struck it with his sandal and killed it. Then when he departed he said: 'God curse the scorpion; it does not leave one who is praying or anyone else, be he a Prophet or anyone else'.[2]

ii. The doctrine of al-Kulaynī and the Shīʿīs:

Al-Kulaynī reports Umm Salamah, the Mother of the Faithful, as saying in regard to the Prophet:

> And he was only a man like the others.[3]

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, reports that the wife of a Companion asked her husband to tell his affair to the Prophet as he did not know what was hidden from him. She said:

> Verily the Prophet is a bashar (human being), so tell him your affair.[4]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.5, p.78. Al-Kulaynī also holds this view and reports that the Prophet felt the sun and occasionally shaded his face with his hand. (Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.4, p.350). This suggests that his body was not transparent. Al-Ḥākim, the Sunnī traditionist, also mentions the shadow of the Prophet (See, Al-Mustadrak, v.4, p.456). This contradicts the report of al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī in his Nawādir al-Uṣūl that the shadow of the Prophet was not seen in the sun nor in the light of the moon (See, al-Suyūṭī, Al-Khaṣāʾiṣ, v.1, p.71). The chain of this report bears ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Qays al-Zaʿfarānī and ʿAbd al-Malik as its transmitters. The former has been charged with composing forgeries (See, al-ʿAsqalānī, Tahdhīb, v.6, p.258) and the latter is majhūl (unknown), so neither are trustworthy. This need not contradict the occasional appearance of the Prophet as having no shadow by way of a miracle.

2. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.390. Al-Kulaynī also reports a scorpion stinging the Prophet. (op.cit., v.4, p.363, v.6, p.327.

3. ibid, v.5, p.565.

4. ibid, v.2, p.139.

The Imām as well as the Prophet did not object to this comment of hers, which suggests that it was approved; however, although her use of the word bashar was correct, the event did not agree with her basic argument that the Prophet was in ignorance of her husband's financial position since God had already intimated this to him.

The illustrious Shīʿī traditionist al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (413 A.H.) writes in Kitāb al-Maqālāt as follows:

> Verily the Apostles of God, the Exalted, are from among bashar (mankind) and His Prophets and the Imams from among the Caliphs are created and invented; pains and pleasures affect them, their bodies grow with eating and in old age become weak; and death comes to them and fanāʾ (annihilation) is close to them. This doctrine is agreed by all (the believers) who believe in Oneness of God.[1]

Al-Ṭabarsī (early Sixth Century A.H.) reports the Prophet as explaining the verse of the Qurʾān as follows:

> 'Say I am but a bashar like you'; this implies that I take food. 'It is revealed to me that your God is One'; this says that he should declare to them, 'I am like you in manhood but my Lord has distinguished me with an Apostleship with which He has not favoured you.'[2]

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (762 A.H.) comments on this issue as follows:

> All the people of the (human) community associate him (the Prophet) with manhood and its essential qualities.[3]

Muḥammad al-Bāqir al-Majlisī gives a very conclusive statement on the question at issue as follows:

> Verily as for the virtues and the actions which cause proximity to God and excellence and which cannot be acquired by human endeavour and manly wisdom it is necessary to attain all this by the

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1, p.373.
2. Al-Ṭabarsī, Iḥtijāj, v.1, p.29.
3. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, op.cit., p.219. Al-Ḥillī further compares the mankind of the Apostles with the excellence of the angels and asserts the superiority of mankind to the angels. (ibid, p.225).

> revelation of God and by having His inspiration.... That is why God sent from among His servants those people who by their spiritual aspect, their sanctity and their purity from human defilements are the inmates of the heavens; and by this aspect of theirs they receive the revelation from their Lord; and by their human aspect and their corporal form and their having the forms and modes of the creation and by their mixing with them in their apparent affairs they convey the revelation to them.... It is necessary that there should be ambassadors between Him and them (the human beings) and it is also necessary that they come from the category of mankind.[1]

Al-Kulaynī admits that although the Apostles are in the form and mode of the creation and they are united with in their human aspects they not associated in any affair of their lives. Al-Kulaynī says:

> Indeed when we proved that there is Our Creator, the Inventor and the Exalted... above us and above all which He created - and the Inventor is the Wise, the Exalted - it is not true that His creation may behold Him nor that they may touch Him; and He may fall into dispute with them and they may fall into dispute with Him. It is then proved that He has ambassadors in His creation who represent Him in His creation and in His servants; and He guides them for their welfare and for their benefit and in what causes them to exist and in the leaving of which is their destruction. This, then, proves that there are the Persons who command (for good) and forbid (from the wrong); and they are sent by The Wise, The Knower, in His creation, and they represent Him, the Glorified and the Mighty, and they are the Prophets, His selection from His creation, the wise endowed with wisdom, who are raised with that wisdom. In spite of being united with other people in creation and form they not associated them in any of the affairs of life; they are supported by the Wise, the Knower, with (heavenly) wisdom.[2]

Al-Majlisī comments upon this tradition as follows:

> It proves and states that it is necessary that there should be a prophet and that he is a human being and that he should have the qualities which the others lack, and these are the miracles which break the (general) laws of nature; and it is also

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1, p.128.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.168.

> necessary that he should lay down the pattern for the people by God's permission, by His Command and His revelation and by His sending down the angel to him. The fundamental thing which he lays down for them is to recognise God and that there is an Inventor of them Who is Powerful, the One who has no associate; and that the Prophet is His servant and His Apostle and that he knows what is hidden and what is evident; and that it is his due that He should be obeyed; and that God has prepared for those who obey him Paradise and for those who disobey him hell; so that the generality of the people wholeheartedly accept his commands revealed on his tongue as coming from God and the angels. In this tradition there is evidence and indication to all of this.[1]

Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī reports ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as stating the nature of the Apostles (of the earth) as follows:

> After the Apostles of the heavens (the angels) there is no one to convey messages from God but the bashar (the human beings).[2]

When it is said that the Prophet is a nūr (light) the traditionists do not intend to reject the doctrine of relating him to mankind but they see two aspects united in him. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, states the creation of the Imāms (and the Prophets also) as follows:

> Verily God originated us from the Light of His Magnificence; then He created our form from the dust which was treasured and concealed beneath the ʿArsh (Throne), and caused that nūr to stay in that dust; so we are the creation and the bashar endowed with light. God has not united anyone with this creation of us.[3]

Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq Ibn Bābawayh (381 A.H.) reports the Prophet as saying:

> ʿAlī and I have been created from One nūr (light). We had been glorifying (the name of) God on the right of the ʿArsh for two thousand years before the creation of Ādam. When He created Ādam He put that nūr in the backbone of Ādam.[4]

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1, p.129.
2. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.1, pp.53-4.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.389.
4. Al-Ṣuddūq, Maʿānī al-Akhbār, v.1, p.56, Al-Khiṣāl, p.172. This report is reconcilable with the Sunnī report that Muḥammad was a Prophet when Ādam had not yet had his soul united with his body (Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.282). Al-Kashshī mentioned ʿAlī as being a bashar. See, Rijāl, p.42.

These traditions do not prevent the Shīʿī traditionists from attributing the essential human qualities to the Prophets. They admit the forgetfulness of the Prophet, although they believe that he is always under the Divine Cover of God. Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as reporting:

> Verily the Apostle of God led the people in the noon-prayer with two rakʿāt and then forgot and gave salām.[1]

On being informed he completed the prayer and made two prostrations of forgetfulness. The Imām comments upon this tradition as follows:

> Verily God had Himself made him forget so that He may have mercy on the community[2] (as to guide them how they should act when they forget in their prayer).

As regards the nature of the body al-Majlisī discusses:

> And as for what is said as to his honourable body being latīf (transparent), that it was not preventing the passing of the sun through it, this is beyond acceptance; for if his body had been so, his clothes would have not been so and if these also had been so would it not have prevented the passing of the rays of the sight?[3]

The Ismāʿīlī sect of the Shīʿīs also agrees with this doctrine that the Prophets are human beings and are united with human beings in their essential qualities. Abū Isḥāq al-Sijistānī (died about 360 A.H.), the eminent Ismāʿīlī thinker, states:

> It is rightly proved from these clear preliminary prefaces that the Apostles are the best of the human beings ... and they are found united with them (the other human beings) in creation as to their corporal qualities.[4]

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.355.
2. ibid, v.3, p.357. This finds support in another report of al-Kulaynī, See, ibid, v.1, p.164. Al-Ṭabarsī favours this point. See, al-Māmaqānī, Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl, v.1, p.208.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1, p.356. He refutes the report that the Prophet had no shadow.
4. Abū Yaʿqūb Isḥāq, Ithbāt al-Nabūʾāt, p.41.

Islām keeps the Prophets at a distance from the status of being worshipped and asserts that they are human beings and that they can never attain a position of Godhead. The Qur'ān says:

> It is not meet for a bashar that God should give him the Book and the judgement and prophethood, and that he should then say to the people: 'Be my servant rather than God's'; but (he would say): 'Be worshippers of the Lord because of your teaching the Book and your reading it'; and he would never enjoin on you that you should take the angels and the Prophets for Lords.[1]

5. The various categories of the Apostles.

i. The origins of the words nabī and rasūl:

In Islām the words nabī and rasūl are generally used for those persons to whom God pleases to give his message. There is also the occasional use of the word mursal which mostly carries a literal sense rather than being accepted as a noun.

The origin of the word nabī is either nabwah or nabāwah (meaning height and elevation) or else it is from naby (meaning the path and the way); or else it is nabī' which is derived from naba' (meaning the information and the news) which would have nubū'ah as a noun; but hamzah may be exchanged for wāw and the two wāws united, as in muruwwah (manliness). In the first two forms it is not mahmūz and the word nabī means 'a man of high rank' or a wayfarer whereas in the third form it is mahmūz and means the informed one. Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq, the Shī'ī scholar (381 A.H.),and Abū Manṣūr al-Shaykh 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (429 A.H.), and Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Māwardī (450 A.H.), the Sunnī scholars, favour one side of the issue as follows:

> Ibn 'Abbās reports that a bedouin said to the Prophet: 'Al-Salām upon you O Nabī' - Allāh! (one who is informed by God)'; the Prophet said: 'I am not the nabī' - Allāh but I am the Nabī - Allāh (one whom God placed in high rank)'; the word nubuwwah has its origin as nabwah and it is used for the elevated places.

1. S 3:78.

> So nubuwwah means height and nabī means the elevated one. I have heard this explanation from Abū Bashar, the philologist in Madīnat al-Salām.[1]

> The (word) nabī in this form means 'man of high-rank near God, the Exalted.[2]

> The word nabī is taken either from naba' and as being mahmūz means news, for he gives news from God and if it is not mahmūz then it is taken from nabwah and means an elevated place, and this is the most appropriate explanation.[3]

The eminent Sunnī scholar of dogmatics ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Firhārwī (1240 A.H.), the Commentator of the Creed of al-Nasafī, corroborates this explanation of Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir and al-Māwardī as follows:

> It is derived from nabāwah and it is muʿtall al-lām and it means elevation and height and it is also applied to the elevated place.[4]

Al-Majlisī discusses this word with reference to Sharḥ al-maqāṣid and gives all the above-quoted three meanings.[5] As regards al-Kulaynī there is an indication in one of his explanations that he is favouring the third of these meanings. He states that the nabī' is 'the informed one'.[6]

The word rasūl is a noun on the pattern of faʿūl and it means the mursal (the sent one). Al-Subkī (of the eighth century A.H.) asserts that there is no other word which is on the pattern of faʿūl which means an object.[7] Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir (429 A.H.) explains this word as follows:

> Rasūl is one to whom it is revealed successively (one after the other). Its origin is from rasala al-labanu when milk is drawn in abundance.[8]

1. Al-Ṣuddūq, Maʿānī al-Akhbār, v.1, p.114.
2. Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir, Uṣūl al-Dīn, p.154.
3. Al-Māwardī, Aʿlām al-Nubuwwah, p.25.
4. Al-Firhārwī, Al-Nibrās, p.8.
5. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., v.1, p.133.
6. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.174.
7. Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, op.cit., v.2, p.281.
8. Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir, op.cit., p.154.

Al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) states: that rasūl is on the measure of fa'ūl; and it is from risālah (the message).[1]

This is the literal discussion of the words nabī and rasūl; but as regards their use as specific terms of Islām they are at times used with synonymous meanings for the messengers of God; but when they are used in comparison with each other there is some difference between the two. There is an indication in the Qur'ān that there is some difference but the apparent use of the Qur'ān does not differentiate them precisely. The Qur'ān says:

> And we did not send before you any rasūl (Apostle) or (any) any nabī (Prophet), but when he desired, the devil made a suggestion in regard to his desire; but God annuls that which the devil casts; then God establishes His communications and He is the Knowing, the Wise.[2]

Al-Bukhārī lays down a Book Chapter-heading: 'The mention of the Prophets'. In this he lays down nine Chapter-headings and begins his comments with Ādam, suggesting that Ādam was a Prophet. He then mentions Nūḥ, and transmits the tradition of intercession on the day of resurrection. Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.) reports that the Prophet said that the people, on that day, will speak to Nūḥ as follows:

> You are the first rasūl to the people of the earth and God named you the servant, the thankful! Do you not see in which condition we are.[3]

This report suggests that al-Bukhārī believes in a difference between the two and states Ādam to be the First Nabī and Nūḥ to be the First Rasūl; this also suggests that all those who are a rasūl are in the first instance a nabī. Al-Bukhārī mentions all of them under the main heading of anbiyā' (the Prophets).

Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, the Imām, reports that Abū Dharr, the

1. Al-Taftāzānī, op.cit., p.164.
2. S 22:52.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.164.

Companion (32 A.H.), asked the Prophet who was the First of the Prophets, and the Prophet replied that it was Ādam. He further asked if he was really a Prophet? The Prophet answered: 'Yes he was a Prophet to whom God spoke'.[1]

ii. The number of the Prophets and the Apostles:

Al-Bukhārī has not given the number of those who are nabī and of those who are rasūl; this suggests that the traditions mentioning the number of the Prophets was not fulfilling al-Bukhārī's conditions for transmission. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal reports that the Prophet told of the number of the Prophets as follows:

> A hundred and twenty-four thousand, among whom were altogether three hundred and fifteen who were rasūl.[2]

The Shīʿī traditionist al-Ṣuddūq also reports the Prophet as stating the number of the Prophets as one hundred and twenty-four thousand.[3] But he does not mention here the number of those who were rasūl.

Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir (429 A.H.) writes:

> The Muslim historians agree that the number of the Prophets is one hundred and twenty-four thousand as these have come down in the rightly proved traditions. The First of them is Ādam and the Last of them is Muḥammad; and they also agree that the Apostles among them are three hundred and thirteen like the number of those who had crossed the river with Ṭālūt and did not drink from that and kept firm in the fight against Jālūt; and the same number was of the Companions with the Prophet at the battle of Badr.[4]

In spite of this the tradition which mentions the number of the Prophets is Khabar al-Wāḥid (a single report) and does not attain the status of celebrity. Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) says:

> And there is no security, in a statement of their number, against their being included

1. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, v.2, p.213.
2. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.511.
3. Al-Ṣuddūq, Al-Khiṣāl, v.2, p.173.
4. Abū Manṣūr, ʿAbd al-Qāhir, op.cit., p.158.

> some who are not among them or against their being excluded from them some that are of them.[1]

Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī (1253 A.H.) comments:

> The number of the Prophets is not certainly known; so it is right to say: 'I believe in all the Prophets, the first of whom is Ādam and the last of them is Muḥammad ... so it is not obligatory to believe that those who are nabī are one hundred and twenty-four thousand and those who are rasūl are three hundred and twenty-three, for that is a single report.[2]

The introduction of each one of the Prophets is not necessary, (although it is necessary that those who have been named in the Book should have been recognised as detailed therein). The Qur'ān says:

> And certainly we sent Apostles before you; there are some of them that we have mentioned to you and there are others whom we have not mentioned to you and it was not meet for an Apostle that he should bring a sign except with God's permission.[3]

iii. The various categories and their functions:

Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī (1014 A.H.) elaborates the difference between the nabī and the rasūl as follows:

> The nabī is more general than the rasūl; the latter is one who is commanded to preach (to others) and the nabī is one to whom revelation is made whether or not he is commanded to preach that. Al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ (544 A.H.) says that the opinion of the generality of scholars is correct that every rasūl is necessarily a nabī but not vice versa.... It is also said that the two words are synonymous terms. Ibn Hammām (861 A.H.) has favoured this opinion but it is evident that they are different because of the injunction of the Qur'ān and the traditions which state the number of the Prophets and the Apostles.[4]

We have already discussed that al-Bukhārī differentiates between them and regards the status of nabī as more general than of the rasūl. Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth

1. Al-Taftāzānī, op.cit., p.169.
2. Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, op.cit., v.1, p.492.
3. S 40:78; S 4:164.
4. Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, op.cit., p.72.

Imām, as differentiating between the nabī and the rasūl as follows:

> The nabī is one who sees the dream and hears the voice but does not actually see the angel; and the rasūl is one who hears the voice and sees the dream and actually sees the angel.[1]

He reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as giving four categories as follows:

> The Prophets and the Apostles have four categories: firstly, the Prophet to whom a message is given in his soul, and his function does not extend to anyone else. Secondly, there is a Prophet who sees the dream and hears the voice but does not see the angel when he is awake, and he has not been sent to anyone and there is an Imām for him as Ībrāhīm acted as Imām for Lūṭ. Thirdly, there is a Prophet who sees the dream, hears the voice and sees the angel and he has been sent to a people whether they are small in number or whether they are numerous; such a one is like Yūnus; God said of him 'and we sent him to a hundred thousand or more'.[2] Indeed they numbered some 130,000; and there is an Imām for him. Finally, there is the one who sees (the angel) when he is awake and he is the Imām like the Prophets who are ulū al-ʿAzm (endowed with firmness and constancy); and verily Ībrāhīm was a Prophet and not an Imām until God said, 'I will make thee an Imām of men.'[3, 4]

This tradition states the function of the Prophets. The function of the first category of the Prophets is not public. We have not found this kind of Prophet in any authentic tradition of the Sunnīs. Instead they mention a category of Muḥaddathūn (the inspired men). Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as saying:

> Verily among the nations who passed before you there had been the Muḥaddathūn and if there is one in my people he is ʿUmar.[5]

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.176.
2. S 37:147.
3. S 2:124.
4. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, pp.174-5.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.211.

The function of the second of the four categories of al-Kulaynī is only to represent the Imām and he himself is not an authority for anyone. Al-Bukhārī does not agree with this view-point and states Lūṭ, the Prophet, as having his own community. He lays down a Chapter-heading and quotes therein the verse of the Qur'ān:

> (And We sent) Lūṭ when he said to his people[1]...[2]

The third and the fourth categories are both givers of good-news and are Warners. They are the nabīs and the rasūls, the Prophets and the Apostles. The Sunnīs agree upon these two categories. Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) says:

> All the Prophets give report and intelligence concerning God, the Exalted; and they are veracious and sincere, and they are innocent and they are never subject to losing their office.[3]

The foremost duty of the Apostles is to tell the people the truth, the right path, and to guide them to the proper way of life; and they call upon the people to follow them and they assert that their lives are a pattern for their people. The Qur'ān says:

> And We did not send any Apostle but that he should be obeyed, by God's permission.[4]

The Qur'ān states the function of Muḥammad as an Apostle as follows:

> Certainly God conferred a benefit upon the believers when He raised among them an Apostle from among themselves, reciting to them His verses and purifying them; and teaching them the Book and the Wisdom.[5]

1. S 7:80.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.180.
3. Al-Nasafī, op.cit., p.170, Nawwāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan, Bughyat al-Rā'id, p.79.
4. S 4:64.
5. S 3:163.

iv. The different modes of revelation.

As regards the modes of revelation, the Qur'ān gives a very comprehensive conclusion. The Qur'ān says:

> And it is not for any bashar that God should speak to him except by (minute) revelation or from behind a veil, or by sending an Apostle so that he reveals by His command, what He pleases; surely He is High, Wise.[1]

Al-Bukhārī reports 'Ā'ishah, the Mother of the Faithful, as stating:

> The first revelation which the Apostle of God received was the true vision in sleep and every vision he saw came like the bright gleam of dawn. He then became fond of solitude and would go alone to the cave on Ḥirā' ... until the truth was manifested for him when he was in the cave on Ḥirā'. The angel came to him and said 'Recite.'[2]

After this initial revelation the angel did not appear to him in his actual vision for a long period and the Prophet saw only a light. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim report Ibn 'Abbās, the Companion, as saying:

> The Apostle of God stayed in Mecca hearing the voice for fifteen years; for seven years he saw the light but nothing along with it; and there were eight years during which revelations were given to him.[3]

Ibn 'Abbās was not born at that time; he was born only three years before the migration of the Prophet to Medina. There is some misunderstanding in respect of the Prophet's period of stay at Mecca; he stayed there only for thirteen years after the commencement of revelation and not for fifteen years; but the mode of revelation expressed therein is beyond any dispute. During this stage of revelation the Prophet received the revelation; and, when there was clear vision of the angel, the revelations were given to the Prophet and he himself felt no anxiety. Al-Bukhārī reports

1. S 42:51.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, p.3.
3. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.521.

al-Ḥārith b. Hishām (18 A.H.) as asking the Prophet what was the mode of revelation to him. The Prophet elaborated it as follows:

> It comes to me at times like the clanging of a bell, and that is the type which is most severe for me; it then leaves me, and I have retained of it what the angel said. At times the angel appears to me in human form and speaks to me and I retain what he says.[1]

ʿĀʾishah, the Mother of the Faithful, says that she saw the Prophet, when revelation came to him, on a very cold day, and his forehead was pouring with sweat when it left him. Al-Bukhārī reports in another chapter that the Prophet said:

> At every occasion of revelation the angel comes. At times the angel is apparent in the clanging of a bell. He leaves me and I retain what he said; and that is the more severe for me; and at times the angel appears to me in a human form and speaks to me and I retain what he says.[2]

Al-Tirmidhī reports that there was a buzzing sound also, near the face of the Prophet, when a revelation came to him (of the type which was more severe for him). ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, reports:

> When a revelation came to him a sound was heard near his face, and it was like the buzzing of the Bee.[3]

ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion (32 A.H.), reports another type of inspiration which descends on the soul. He reports the Prophet as saying:

> The Faithful Spirit (the Spirit of Holiness) has blown in my soul (given inspiration) that a soul will never die till it obtains its whole provision. So fear God, be moderate in making requests, and do not let the idea that your provision has been delayed induce you to seek it by acts of disobedience to God; for what God has can be attained only by obedience to Him.[4]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, p.2.
2. ibid, v.4, p.136.
3. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.201.
4. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrizī, op.cit., p.452.

Al-Kulaynī also reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as transmitting this tradition from the Prophet.[1] These traditions suggest that there were the revelations apart from the Qur'ān , and in this type of revelation also the angel was involved. There is an indication of this type of revelation in the Qur'ān as well:

> The Faithful Spirit has descended with it upon your heart that you may be of the Warners; in plain Arabic language.[2]

6. The Apostleship is God's election and cannot be acquired by spiritual mortification.

The Apostleship is a benefit of God, His own election, and not a position which could be acquired by worship, and spiritual mortification. The Qur'ān says:

> Their Apostles said to them: 'We are nothing but human beings like yourselves, but God bestows (His) favours on whom He pleases of His servants.[3]

> And thus do We try some of them by others so that they say: 'Are these those upon whom God has conferred benefit from among us? Does not God best know the grateful.'?[4]

> And they say: 'Why was not this Qur'ān revealed to a man of importance in the two towns?' 'Will they distribute the mercy of your Lord?'[5]

> And when a communication comes to them they say: 'We will not believe till we are given the like of what God's Apostles are given'.[6] God best knows where He places His message.

These verses explain that Apostleship is God's own selection and none can acquire it on his own accord.

i. Al-Bukhārī's evidence:

The first Book Chapter-heading of the Al-Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī is Kitāb al-Waḥy (The Book relating to revelation).

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.74.
2. S 26:193-4.
3. S 14:11.
4. S 6:53.
5. S 43:31, 32.
6. S 6:125.

It is with this that he starts his work and introduces his book. He gives there the report of Abū Sufyān when the latter, with some of his companions, was in Syria and Heraclius, the Emperor of Byzantium had received the letter of the Prophet inviting him to embrace Islām. It was the time when there was the peace between the Prophet and the Quraysh of Mecca. Heraclius summoned the Arab-traders and asked them some questions through his interpreter. The Emperor asked Abū Sufyān:

> Has anyone of you said this (made a claim to prophecy) before him?

Abū Sufyān answered in the negative. Heraclius then elaborated his point as follows:

> I asked you whether anyone of you had said this thing before him and you said that no one had done so, for if someone had said this before him I would have considered that he was a man who was trying to approach the same thing which had been said before.... If what you say is true his kingdom will certainly reach to what is under my feet. I knew that he would come forth but did not think that he would be from among you. If I knew I could get to him I would like to meet him and if I were with him I would wash his feet.[1]

Al-Bukhārī, by bringing this report in the context of the beginning of revelation, indicates that one cannot aspire to prophethood and it cannot be acquired gradually by any mystical exercise; but it is the election of God which He confers unawares upon one with whom He is pleased. The Companions did not reject this interpretation of Heraclius and apparently they approved this point in regard to prophethood. Al-Bukhārī reports in another Chapter of his as follows:

> ... until the Truth came to him all of a sudden when he was in the cave of Ḥirā; so the angel came to him therein.[2]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, p.6; v.4, pp.56-7.
2. ibid, v.9, p.37.

The opinion of Heraclius corroborates the following verse of the Qur'ān as follows:

> And you did not expect that the Book would be revealed to you but it is a mercy from your Lord.[1]

The eminent Sunnī traditionist Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (848 A.H.) states:

> The Prophethood is a benefit of God which He confers upon the one whom He selects from the people of knowledge and action. There is no technique for the bashar (human beings) ever to acquire it.[2]

Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad al-Qalqashandī (9th century A.H.) attacks the followers of Aristotle as follows:

> They say that the links of Apostleship are unlimited and that they are acquired; that man can acquire them by spiritual exercise. These two theses are among the reasons for which they have been declared unbelievers, (firstly) for their proposing the possibility of further prophethood after the Prophet with relation to whom God said 'He was the last of the Prophets', and (secondly) for their saying that it could be acquired by acquisition.[3]

ii. Al-Kulaynī's evidence.

Al-Kulaynī says that the Imāmah is also a choice of God and that it is not a position which can be acquired by human efforts. This depicts his doctrine in regard to Apostleship also that any Divine status cannot be acquired by mystical approach and spiritual mortification. Al-Kulaynī reports al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, as saying:

> Verily the Imāmah is higher in value, greater in dignity, superior in condition, more preserved in its aspect and too remote in its depth than that it could be acquired through human wisdom or that they should obtain it by their own ideas or that they should appoint an Imām by their own choice.... Verily the status of the Imāmah is the same as the status of the Prophets.[4]

1. S 28:86.
2. Al-Dhahabī, Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ, v.3, p.127.
3. Al-Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ al-Aʿshā, v.13, p.305.
4. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, pp.199-200

The Ismā'īlīs also corroborate this doctrine that this is a Divine status to which no human approach can be made. Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijistānī (about 360 A.H.) writes:

> There is no power of mankind to establish that.[1]

Now we turn to the most important aspect of Apostleship, the qualities of the Prophet, and how they could easily be recognised. There are three points upon which stress can be laid as being the fundamental qualities of the Prophets and the Apostles. Firstly they agree with each other in principle and in their conception of God and the Hereafter. Secondly they are preserved from all the major and the minor sins; and, if there is a rare occurrence of any unintentional mistake in any of their worldly affairs or if they fall into forgetfulness, they are not left unattended but are checked and set on the right path. Thirdly they have the support of miracles by which God breaks the normal conduct of nature.

7. The Quality of the Prophets wherein they are basically at one.

The Qur'ān states all the Prophets to be at one in calling mankind to One God and to belief in the Hereafter. The Qur'ān asserts that the Prophet Muḥammad is not a new Prophet but that he is linked with the previous Prophets. He differs from them in some applications of religion since he has been endowed with a new Sharī'ah;[2] but in principle and in the fundamental doctrines they are all related to one religion. The Qur'ān says:

> It is the same religion He has established for you as that which He enjoined upon Nūḥ; and that which we have revealed to you and that which we enjoined upon Ibrāhīm and Mūsā and 'Īsā, that you should remain steadfast in religion and be not divided therein; hard to the unbelievers is the way to which you call them; God chooses for Himself whom He pleases and guides to Himself the one who turns to Him.[3]

1. Abū Ya'qūb Isḥāq, op.cit., p.55.
2. The Qur'ān says: 'Then We have made you follow a sharī'ah (course) in the affair, therefore follow it.' (S 45:18).
3. S 42:13.

There is another injunction of the Qur'ān in this context:

> Surely we have revealed to you as we revealed to Nūh and the Prophets after him, and we revealed to Ibrāhīm, Ismā'īl, Ishāq, Ya'qūb and the tribes, and to 'Īsā, Ayyūb, Yūnus, Hārūn and Sulaymān, and we gave to Dā'ūd a scripture; and we sent Apostles we have mentioned to you before and Apostles we have not mentioned to you and God addressed to Mūsā His word speaking (to him). [1]
>
> 'These are they whom God guided, therefore follow their guidance. Say: I do not ask for any reward for it; it is nothing but a reminder to the nations.'[2]
>
> 'Nothing is said to you but what was said to the Apostles before you.'[3]
>
> 'And we did not send before any Apostle but we revealed to him that there is no God but me, therefore serve me.'[4]

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach on the point at issue.

Al-Bukhārī reports Mujāhid (100 A.H.), the Successor and the pupil of Ibn 'Abbās, as explaining the first of the above-quoted Qur'ānic statements as follows:

> Muhammad! we have enjoined upon you and Nūh dīn wāhid (one religion)[5]

Al-Bukhārī gives the second of the above-quoted Qur'ānic statements as a Chapter-heading and then reports the Prophet as saying:

> It is not meet for anyone to say that I am superior to Yūnus b. Matā.[6]

Al-Bukhārī suggests that, in the basic conception of Apostleship, all the Prophets are equal and at one. He reports Ibn 'Abbās as explaining the third of the above-quoted Qur'ānic statements as follows:

> Your Prophet has been commanded to follow the path of the previous Prophets.[7]

1. S 4:163-4.
2. S 6:91.
3. S 41:43.
4. S 21:25.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, p.9.
6. ibid, v.6, p.62.
7. ibid, v.4, p.196.

Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as saying:

> I am the nearest of kin to ʿĪsā b. Maryam in this world and the next. The Prophets are brothers, sons of one father by fellow-wives; their mothers are different but their religion is one.[1]

ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach on the point at issue.

Al-Kulaynī reports Muḥammad al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as stating:

> Verily God, the Mighty and the Glorified, sent Nūḥ to his people that 'they should worship God and fear Him and obey him[2] (Nūḥ).' He then called the people to One God and that they should worship Him and he did not associate anyone with Him. Then all the Prophets were sent with that purpose till the sequence of them reached Muḥammad. He also called the people to worship God and not to associate anyone with Him; and God said: 'The same religion He has established for you as that which He enjoined upon Nūḥ and that which We have revealed to you and that which we enjoined upon Ibrāhīm and Mūsā and ʿĪsā that you should remain steadfast in religion and be not divided therein'[3] ... 'He established for each of the Prophets a law and a course'[4] ... and said to Muḥammad: 'Surely we have revealed to you as we have revealed to Nūḥ and the Prophets after him'.[5; 6]

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, corroborates this doctrine as follows:

> Verily God bestowed upon Muḥammad the religious Dogma of Nūḥ, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, and ʿĪsā, the Oneness of God, Sincerity (as to His Oneness), and the giving up of associates, and the general nature of Ḥanīf in which there is no hue of rahbānīyah (keeping aloof) or of siyāḥah (ascetic itinerancy), and he made lawful to them the good things and made unlawful to them the impure things and removed from them their burden and the shackles which were upon them.[7]

1. ibid, v.4, p.203.
2. See, S 71:3.
3. S 42:13.
4. S 5:48.
5. S 4:163-4.
6. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.29.
7. ibid, v.2, p.17.

8. <u>The Quality of the Prophets as being Maʿṣūm (sinless)</u>.

The Qurʾānic conception in regard to all the Prophets is that they are sent to set a pattern for their Communities and that the people should obey them. The Qurʾān asserts that it is good to follow them and it is an evil to disobey them. This conception requires that they should be guarded under the Divine guard and if they are allowed to commit sins it establishes that the sins are also the patterns for the nations. The Qurʾān says:

> 'And we did not send any Apostle but that he should be obeyed by God's permission.'[1]

The Qurʾān regards the emulation of the Prophet as being the basis for the good pleasure of God and it is evident that God is not pleased with sins. So it is required from the believers to accept the Prophet as their judge in all their disputes. The Qurʾān says:

> 'Say: If you love God then follow me. God will love you and forgive you your faults and God is Forgiving, Merciful.'[2]

> 'But no! by your Lord! they do not believe until they make you a judge of that which has become a matter of dispute among them, and they do not find any constraint in their hearts as to what you have decided and they submit with entire submission.'[3]

> 'Certainly you have in the Apostle of God an excellent exemplar for him who hopes in God and the Last Day and remembers God much.'[4]

It is not meet for a Prophet to be dishonest in any sphere of his life. The Qurʾān says:

> And it cannot be attributed to a Prophet that he should act unfaithfully; and he who acts unfaithfully shall bring forward that in respect of which he has acted unfaithfully on the day of resurrection.[5]

1. S 4:64.
2. S 3:30.
3. S 4:65.
4. S 33:21.
5. S 3:160.

The Qur'ān speaks as follows to the Prophet Muḥammad as to how God safeguards him from even a minute inclination towards a sin:

> 'And had it not been that We had already confirmed you, you would certainly have been near to inclining to them a little.'[1]

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach on the point at issue.

Al-Bukhārī reports that on the day of Ḥunayn the Prophet divided the booty with some preference for Al-Aqraʿ b. Ḥābis, ʿUyaynah b. Badr, Zayd al-Ṭā'ī and ʿAlqamah (or ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufayl) and some other Arab chiefs. One man (Dhū al-Khuwayṣirah from the Banū Tamīm) made objections to the division of the Prophet and said:

> 'This division is not made equitably and the pleasure of God is not sought therein.'

This was brought to the notice of the Prophet and the Prophet said:

> 'Who will act equitably if I do not? God may have mercy on Mūsā, he brooked more than this and yet he observed patience.'[2]

Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī reports about the division of the gold which ʿAlī had sent from Yaman; and the Prophet divided that among the chiefs of Najd. A man with deep-set eyes, a projecting brow, a thick beard, high cheekbones and a shaven head came forward and said: 'Fear God, Muḥammad!' The Prophet said:

> 'Who will obey God if I disobey Him? God entrusts me with truth over the inhabitants of the earth but you do not.'[3]

> 'I am the trustee of One who is in the Heavens; and the news of the Heavens comes to me day and night.'

> ... 'Out upon you! Am I not the most fearful of God among all those who are on earth.'[4]

Someone, either ʿUmar[5] or Khālid,[6] asked for permission to kill that man but the Prophet did not allow that.

1. S 17:74. 2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.115.
3. ibid, v.4, p.167. 4. ibid, v.5, p.207.
5. See, ibid, v.9, p.21. 6. See, ibid, v.4, p.167.

Al-Bukhārī reports ʿĀʾishah, the Mother of the Faithful, as saying:

> The Prophet was never given his choice between two things but he took the lesser of them provided it involved no sin, for if it did, no one kept farther away from it than he. And the Prophet never took revenge on his own behalf for anything unless something which God had forbidden had been transgressed, in which case he took revenge for it for the sake of God.[1]

Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> Verily you know that I am the most fearful of God, the most truthful, and the most virtuous among you all.[2]

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr says that the Prophet allowed him to write the traditions and gave him the following assurance:

> By God in whose Hand my life is possessed nothing comes out of this (making an indication to his mouth) but the truth.[3]

Abū Ḥanīfah, the Imām (150 A.H.), states the Sunnī doctrine as follows:

> All the Prophets are safeguarded from the major and the minor sins and from unbelief and evil; yet there have been (from some Prophets) some slips and mistakes.[4]

Qāḍī Abū Zayd comments:

> These slips are never left without being clarified that they are indeed only slips; this may be described either by the Prophet himself as when Mūsā explained, after he had killed the Qibṭī with his fist that 'this was on account of the devil's doing';[5] or God, the Glorified, may explain the matter as He said in relation to Ādam: 'And Ādam disobeyed His Lord and allowed himself to be seduced.'[6] It has also been said that this step[7] occurred before the Prophethood was conferred upon him, for God says: 'Then His Lord chose him, so He turned to him and guided him'.[8, 9]

1. ibid, v.4, p.230.
2. ibid, v.9, p.138.
3. Abū Daʾūd, op.cit., v.2, p.514.
4. Abū Ḥanīfah, Fiqh al-Akbar, p.22-3 (with commentary of al-Shaykh Abū al-Muntahā).
5. S 28:15.
6. S 20:121.
7. This was only a slip and not a sin as it was not united with Ādam's intention to disobey God. The Qurʾān says: 'We did not find in him any determination to disobey God'. S 20:115.
8. S 20:122
9. Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar, p.70.

Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī (1014 A.H.) gives a very conclusive statement:

> No one of the Sunnīs has even admitted that the Prophets intentionally do any wrong; but that occurs unintentionally on account of forgetfulness and oversight and it is named as zallah (slip). Al-Qūnawī says: 'The people differ in regard to the nature of ʿIṣmah (protection from sins); some say it is merely a benefit of God and that man has no option in it. It is either a part of their creation as being different from that of others, so that they have no inclination to sin and no separation from obedience as in the nature of the angels; or else their avoidance of evil deeds and their leanings towards virtues is donation from God after He has endowed them with the human qualities. And some scholars say ʿIṣmah is a benefit from God and a sign of His affection; but this is in such a way that, after (being endowed with) ʿIṣmah, they have power to take initiatives for good and hold back from the sins. This is the opinion of al-Shaykh Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī; he says that ʿIṣmah does not preclude hardship and temptation. This implies that it does not compel the Prophets to obey and does not make them incapable of sin.[1]

ʿAlī al-Qārī defines ʿIṣmah in another discussion as follows:

> The state of ʿIsmah means that God may not create sins for a man in spite of his having the power and option.[2]

ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach on the point at issue.

Al-Kulaynī corroborates the report of al-Bukhārī which we have already given regarding the day of Ḥunayn when some people had made objections to the division of booty which the Prophet was making to win over some men's hearts (as a matter of taʾlīf al-qalb). Zurārah, the Companion, reports al-Bāqir the Imām as saying:

> God then poured down the light (of their Īmān, belief).[3]

This suggests that it is not allowed in Islām to ascribe any wrong to the Prophet; and this is also true of the doctrine of ʿIṣmah,

1. ibid., p.71.
2. ibid, p.180.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.411.

the sinless status of the Prophets.

Al-Kulaynī discusses how there will be a witness from every people (Ummah) on the day of resurrection and how the Prophet Muḥammad will also be brought as a witness relating to his people. He then reports that the Divine Imāms are also the witnesses in respect of the creation and that the Prophet will be a witness in respect of them. Al-Kulaynī then reports ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as saying:

> Verily God has purified us, protected us (from sins) and made us witnesses in respect of His creation and His authority on the earth and accompanied us with the Qur'ān and the Qur'ān with us; we do not depart from it nor does it depart from us.[1]

This statement of ʿAlī covers the Prophet also. Muḥammad al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, states:

> Verily the Prophets do not commit any sin because they are Maʿṣūmūn (the ones protected from sin), the Muṭahharūn (the purified ones). They do not commit any offence, nor do they do any wrong, nor do they commit any sin, be that a minor or a major one.[2]

The Imām further states:

> God said to Muḥammad: 'I created you and you were nothing and I inspired in you My spirit as an honour from me; I honoured you by the fact that I established obedience to you as obligatory for all my creation. So one who obeys you has obeyed me and one who disobeys you has disobeyed me.'[3]

This procedure for actions cannot be asserted unless it is established that the Prophet's pattern of actions is pleasing to God and is sinless. If they slip a little it is also set right and treated as forgiven so that their example may not be doubtful and disdained. Al-Kulaynī reports ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as saying:

> As to what has been mentioned of the affair of the foremost, they are the Prophets, whether they are Apostles or whether they are not Apostles. God endowed them with the five

1. ibid, v.1, p.191.
2. Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq, op.cit., v.2, p.35.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.440.

> spirits, the spirit of Holiness, the spirit of Belief, the spirit of power, the spirit of desire, and the spirit of the flesh. By the spirit of Holiness they are raised as the Prophets, Apostles and the like, and by that spirit they acknowledge things; by the spirit of Belief they worship God and do not associate anyone with Him; by the spirit of power they fight against their enemies and arrange for their own livelihood; by the spirit of desire they have delicious food and marry young women as allowed; and by the spirit of the flesh they walk and go their way: they are the ones whose dhunūb (mistakes and slips) are treated as forgiven and disregarded.[1]

Then the Imām recited:

> We have made some of these Apostles to excel the others; among them there are those to whom God has spoken and some of them He has exalted by degrees of rank and to ʿĪsā we gave clear attestations.[2]

Al-Ṭūsī (672 A.H.), the eminent Shīʿī scholar of dogmatics, states:

> It is obligatory for the Prophet to remain protected (from sins) so that trust is established and the object of their exaltation among the people is fulfilled.[3]

Al-Ḥillī (962 A.H.) comments:

> ʿIṣmah (protection from sins) does not reject the power (to sin) but rather the maʿṣūm (the protected one) has the power of committing sins; otherwise he would not have been praised for avoiding sins.[4]

Al-Majlisī, the second, gives a very comprehensive statement on this issue:

> So, on account of his perfect acknowledgement of God, the Prophet keeps himself always under the guard of his Lord and apart from that which pleases his beloved God nothing occurs to his mind; and if there is the occasional idea of any misdeed his observance of the glory of God does not allow him to act upon that. If it is so as

1. ibid, v.2, p.282.
2. S 2:253.
3. Al-Ṭūsī, Tajrīd al- Iʿtiqād, p.217.
4. Al-Ḥillī, Kashf al-Murād, p.228. Al-Ḥillī asserts that this is the essential quality of the Divine Imāms also. (See, al-Ḥillī, Minhāj al-Karāmah, p.147.

> some people think that God forces him to give up sins then protection from sin is surely not an excellence for him nor will he be rewarded for giving that up. It should be recognised here that the verses of the Qur᾿ān and the reports which give an idea of their performing any wrong are to be interpreted either as performance of an undesired thing (not reaching the status of sin) or else they may suggest that it is a question of the neglect of the better verse.
>
> In view of the honoured status of the Prophets any undesirable action or any neglect of the better verse is a light matter; so it is at times expressed as a fault (although it is not really a fault). There are some other reasons too which I have mentioned in Ḥayāt al-Qulūb. As regards some stories of the Prophets which have been given in tafsīr and ta᾿rīkh literature, most of them are forgeries and accusations which the Sunnīs have taken from the Jewish literature.[1]

This Shīʿī statement is consistent with the preceding Sunnī statement of ʿAlī al-Qārī and it bears evidence that both the Schools of Islām believe in the sinless status of the Prophets and it is in the light of this fundamental belief that they interpret some events of some Prophets in which the doctrine of ʿIṣmah (Divine protection of the Prophets) is discussed as being involved.

9. The Miracles of the Prophets.

The Qur᾿ān and the rightly proved traditions bear evidence that God had supported His Prophets with miracles which break the general laws of nature. In general the word muʿjizāt is used in this context and it means actions which frustrate the opponents. This word is not found in the Qur᾿ān nor was it ever used by the Prophet. Instead, the Qur᾿ān uses the words āyah[2] (indication), burhān[3] (proof) and bayyīnah[4] (evidence) in this respect. The early traditionists use the word ʿalāmāt (signs) as al-Bukhārī has mentioned.[5] But the Scholastic theologians and the late

1. Al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.11.
2. See, S 6:110, S 7:106, S 7:132, 133, S 11:64, S 21:5, S 28:36, S 29:50, S 54:2.
3. See, S 4:175, S 28:32.
4. See, S 2:253, S 4:153.
5. Al-Bukharī, op.cit., v.4, p.232.

traditionists use the word mu'jizāt also for the proofs of prophethood. Abū Ḥanīfah uses the word āyat in Fiqh al-Akbar and it has been explained as Mu'jizāt. The Imām writes:

> The āyāt (miracles) are proved for the Prophets.[1]

Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī (403 A.H.) wrote a very comprehensive book on miracles and named that book of his Kitāb al-Bayān ʿan al-Farq bayn al-Mu'jizāt wa al-Karāmāt; and it shows that the word mu'jizāt had already established its common use in the fourth century. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī (743 A.H.) has used it in one of his Chapter-headings in his Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ.[2]

The Qur'ān mentions the mu'jizāt of all the Prophets except those of Isma'īl, Isḥāq, Dhū al-Kifl and al-Yasa'. This does not mean that they had no such indications to prove that they were from God but it is due to the fact that the Qur'ān lays stress, in this respect, only on those Prophets who faced grave opposition.

Al-Bukhārī holds that all the Prophets were endowed with such Divine support. Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> No Prophet has failed to be given miracles which thereby caused men to believe in him; what I have been given is a revelation which God gave to me and I hope that I may be the one among them who will have the largest following on the day of resurrection.[3]

The Qur'ān states the Mu'jizah as being the creation of God which honours and supports the Prophets and does not establish it to be a creation of a man. The Qur'ān says:

> And it is not in (the power of) an Apostle to bring a sign except by God's permission; for every term there is an appointment.[4]
>
> And they swear by God with the strongest of their oaths, that if a sign came to them they would most certainly believe in it. Say: Signs are only with God and that should make you know that when it comes they will not believe.[5]

1. Abū Ḥanīfah, Fiqh al-Akbar, p.3.
2. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.530.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.113.
4. S 13:38.
5. S 6:110.

The Muʿjizah confronts the normal conduct of the universe and it is described as breaking the general laws of nature. God is the Creator of the laws and it is impossible for the created one to break the normal conduct of nature. When God pleases to honour and support His Apostles He Himself breaks and then expresses His particular laws to introduce His Power as being the origin of everything. The source of this expression of God is in His Attributes of Power. Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as stating that it was in God's power that He could turn the fire cold.[1]

Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī (403 A.H.) states:

> Verily the Muʿjiz (miracle) cannot be a muʿjiz (that which causes others to be disabled) unless it is only in God's power to cause that and it is not right that any creature from among the angels, bashar (mankind) and Jinn may have power to cause that.[2]

i. The influence of the miracles.

There is also a discussion as to whether the evidence of miracles for the true claim of Prophethood is based on reason or whether it is based on practice (ʿādah) as no one can overrule the laws of nature but the one who has Divine support from the heavens. The Ashʿarīs favour the second position. It is a miracle if fire does not burn a man but this does not directly prove that such a man is a Prophet; however such a miracle can point to the over-ruling Power of God over against the normal conduct of the universe.

Miracles, in general, influence the average group of mankind. The foremost believers read the signs of the truth in the character of the Prophets and do not demand from them any signs. Yūshaʿ b. Nūn did not demand from Mūsā any miracle nor did the early Companions (Ḥawārīyūn) of ʿĪsā demand any miracle from him, as Abū Bakr also did not make any demand of miracles from Muḥammad.

The stubborn and the obdurate and the intractable people do not admit the truth even after having seen the miracles

1. See al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.369.
2. Al-Bāqillānī, Kitāb al-Bayān, p.8.

of the Prophet but they accuse them of being magicians. The Qur'ān says:

> So when Our clear signs came to them, they said: This is clear enchantment. And they denied them unjustly and proudly while their souls had been convinced of them; consider then what was the end of the mischief-makers.[1]

> Thoughtless of heart; and those who are unjust counsel together in secret: "He is nothing but a bashar like yourselves. What! Will you then yield to enchantment while you see?[2]

> And when Our clear communications are recited to them, those who disbelieve say with regard to the truth when it comes to them: This is clear enchantment.[3]

These verses of the Qur'ān explain why the cold fire beneath the feet of Ibrāhīm, the miraculous rod turning into a serpent, the sudden healing at the hands of ʿĪsā, and the splitting of the moon at the hands of Muḥammad had no effect on their opponents so as to make them accept their claims.

ii. The various kinds of miracles.

While respecting all the Prophets of God the Qur'ān lays stress on Mūsā and ʿĪsā and discusses them and their people, the people of the Book, in greater detail, for they were the established religious circles when the Qur'ān was revealed.

The sending down of food in form of manna and quails[4] honoured the Banū Isrā'īl, and the request of ʿĪsā b. Maryam from God to send down mā'idah (food) to them from the heavens[5] indicates that this type of miracle has always been a medium of blessing for the believers. Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet Muḥammad as having performed this sort of miracle on various occasions.

The Qur'ān reports ʿĪsā b. Maryam as having shown his people that he knew various secret matters such as what they

1. S 27:13, 14. 2. S 21:3. 3. S 46:7.
4. S 2:57. 5. S 5:114.

had eaten and what they had stored in their houses.[1] Al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī report many incidents when the Prophet Muḥammad foretold what things were to occur and unveiled affairs which were veiled.

The spiritual treatment of the sick and of people in distress is another category of miracles. The Qur'ān mentions this type of sudden healing at the hands of ʿĪsā[2]; and al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī report that Muḥammad also showed this instant healing of the sick on various occasions.

We give here the traditionists' approach on these three various categories of miracles.

(a) The sending down of food.

(i) ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion (32 A.H.), reports:

> We (the Companions) used to consider the āyāt (miracles) as a blessing but you account them as something to cause fear. Once when we were on a journey in the company of the Prophet and there was a dearth of water he said: 'Look to see if there is any water left': They brought him a vessel containing a little water. He then put his hand into it and said: 'Come to this blessed cleansing medium; the blessing is from God': I could see the water spurting from the fingers of the Prophet and we could hear the food glorifying God as it was being taken.[3]

Al-Bukhārī suggests here that in regard to the miracles the source of Power is in the Hand of God and that they are the creation of God and not of the Prophets themselves. Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), reports another such incident where the water spurted from the fingers of the Prophet.[4] Al-Majlisī, the Shīʿī traditionist, corroborates the report that water spurted from the fingers of the Prophet.[5]

Al-Kulaynī also holds that miracles are the creation of God and not of the Prophets themselves. It was in God's power that He turned the fire cold when He was pleased to

1. S 3:48.
2. S 3:48.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.235.
4. ibid, v.4, p.233.
5. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.14.

honour Ibrāhīm and frustrate his opponents.[1] However we shall discuss this in detail later on.[2] Here we make the point that Al-Kulaynī is consistent with al-Bukhārī on this aspect of miracles namely that they are God's creation.
(ii) Jābir b. ᶜAbd Allāh, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports another incident of blessing and abundance of food as follows:

> We were digging at the battle of the Trench and there appeared a huge block of rock as an obstruction. They (the Companions) then went to the Prophet and said: 'This block of rock has appeared as an obstruction in the Trench'. The Prophet said: 'I shall go down'; then he stood up and he had a stone tied on his belly (for the purpose of allaying the pangs of hunger), for we had been three days without tasting any food. The Prophet then took the pick and struck the rock and it became a mound of crumbling sand. I asked the Prophet to allow me to go to the house (and permission was granted). I then told my wife that I had seen the Prophet in a state (of hunger) to exhaust anyone's endeavour and asked her whether she had anything to eat. She said that she had barley and a lamb. I then slaughtered the lamb and she ground the barley, and we put the meat in the pot. Then I went to the Prophet and the dough had been divided up and the pot was on the fire and bubbling; and I said (in secret): 'I have prepared the meal. So come Prophet of God! and let one or two accompany you'; he asked me how much there was and I told him. He said that this was ample and that it was good. He then asked me to say to my wife that she should not pour curry from the pot and should not bake the dough in the oven till he (the Prophet) reached her. He then asked everyone to stand. So all the immigrants and the helpers stood and when he (Jābir) came to his wife and told her in anxiety that the Prophet with all the immigrants and the helpers and all those who were there were coming. Jābir said that she asked him whether he (the Prophet) had asked him (how much it was?) Jābir said that he answered in the affirmative. The Prophet said: 'Come in and do not jostle each other'; and he began to cut the bread and to put meat on it and he covered the pot and the oven when he took from it; and he brought (the vessel) near to his Companions and then he took it back. He kept distributing the bread and serving handfuls of meat

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.369.
2. See, P. 162.

> until they were satisfied and there was still some left over. He then said (to Jābir's wife): 'Do take it and give to others for the people fell hungry'.[1]

Jābir reports that they were a thousand present and he says: 'I swear by God that they ate till they left it and went away, and our pot was boiling as it had been and our dough was being baked as before.'[2]

(iii) Al-Barrā' b. ʿĀzib, the Companion, also reports:

> On the day of al-Hudaybīyah we were accompanied by the Prophet and we numbered fourteen hundred. Now al-Hudaybīyah was a well which we drained leaving not a drop in it. The Prophet then sat down on the edge of the well and called for a vessel of water. He rinsed his mouth and poured the water into the well. We stayed for a time; and then we drank and we were satisfied and our animals were also satisfied.[3]

These rightly-proved reports bear ample evidence that on the basis of God's blessing and His honour for the Prophet there occurred increase in the food and it was clearly against the normal conduct of the universe.

(b) The knowledge of future and hidden affairs.

(i) ʿAdī b. Ḥātim, the Companion (67 A.H.), reports that he was present when a man came to the Prophet and complained to him of poverty; then another man came and complained to him of highway robbery. ʿAdī reports that the Prophet said to him:

> 'Have you seen al-Ḥīrah, ʿAdī ?'

He answered in the negative but he said that he had information of that. The Prophet then said:

> 'If you live long enough you will certainly see a woman travelling from al-Ḥīra going round the Kaʿbah fearing no one but God; and if you live long enough the treasures of the Chosroes will certainly be conquered'; ʿAdī asked whether he meant Kisrā b. Hurmuz?

The Prophet answered in the affirmative and further stated:

1. Al-Bukhārī, op. cit., v.5, pp.138-9.
2. ibid, v.5, p.139.
3. ibid, v.4, p.234.

> If you live long you will certainly see a man coming out with a handful of gold or silver looking for someone to accept it but finding no one to accept it from him....

ʿAdī confirmed the fulfilment of the first and the second predictions and asked the others to wait for the occurrence of the third as follows:

> I have seen a woman travelling from al-Ḥīrah to go round the Kaʿbah, fearing no one but God; and I was among those who conquered the treasures of Kisrā b. Hurmuz; and if you live long enough you will see what the Prophet Abū al-Qāsim described as 'one coming out with his hand full'.[1]

This report shows that the Prophet had been divinely endowed with the future and the hidden affairs.

(ii) Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), reports:

> The Prophet announced the death of Zayd, Jaʿfar, and Ibn Rawāḥah (to the people) before news of these events had reached them, saying, 'Zayd took the standard and has been smitten, then Jaʿfar took it and has been smitten, then Ibn Rawāḥah took it and has been smitten'; and the tears were dripping from his eyes. The Prophet further said that finally the sword of God (hinting at Khālid b. al-Walīd) took that standard till God granted them success.[2]

Al-Kulaynī corroborates this report of al-Bukhārī and transmits from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> The Prophet was sitting in the Mosque when every high-born (man/head) was lowered to him and every low-born (man) had raised (his head) towards him till he gazed towards Jaʿfar who was fighting against the unbelievers. The Prophet then said that Jaʿfar was slain; and colic pain in the belly caught him (the Prophet).[3]

(iii) Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.) makes another report that a man who had acted as secretary to the Prophet apostatised from Islām and turned Christian. He said that Muḥammad did not say anything except what he had been writing for him. The man died and the people buried him.

1. ibid, v.4, p.240.
2. ibid, v.5, p.182.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.376.

In the morning they found him cast up out of the earth. They alleged that this was done by Muḥammad and his Companions as the deceased had forsaken them; and that they had opened his grave and cast him out. They again dug a grave for him and did so more deeply. In the morning the ground had again cast him out. They again remarked as previously, and dug again as deep as they could but the ground again cast him out. They then knew that it had not been done by men and they left him cast up on the earth.[1]

The Prophet had predicted for him as follows:

> The earth will not accept him.[2]

(c) <u>The healing of the sick</u>.

(i) Al-Barrā' b. ʿĀzib, the Companion (72 A.H.), reports that when ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAtīk killed Abū Rāfiʿ, the Jewish trader and the bitterest foe of the Prophet, he came back staggering. He states:

> I put the sword in his belly till it came out at his back, and I knew that I had killed him. I then began to open the doors, door by door, till I came to a stair but I put my foot on it; and I felt that I had fallen to the floor; I fell in moon-light and broke my leg. I tied it with a turban.... Then I came to the Prophet and told him. He asked me to stretch out my leg and when I had done so he passed his hand over it. It seemed as though I had never had anything wrong with it.[3]

(ii) Sahl b. Saʿd, the Companion, reports that the Prophet said on the day of Khaybar that he should give his standard on the next day to a man in whose hands there would be victory and who loved God and His Prophet and was loved by God and His Prophet.... The next day he asked where ʿAlī was. On being informed that ʿAlī was suffering from eye trouble he told them to send for him; and when he was brought the Prophet spat in his eyes and prayed for him

1. Al-Bukhārī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.4, p.246.
2. Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, <u>op.cit</u>., p.535.
3. Al-Bukhārī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.5, p.118.

and he recovered. Al-Bukhārī reports:

> It seemed as if nothing had been wrong with him.[1]

(iii) Yazīd b. Abū ʿUbayd, the Successor (147 A.H.) reports:

> I have seen the mark of a blow on the leg of Salamah (b. al-Akwaʿ) and asked: 'What is this blow O Abū Muslim?' He replied: 'It is a blow which I received at the battle of Khaybar which made the people say: 'Salamah has been killed:' I then went to the Prophet who blew spittle on it three times, and up to now I have been having no trouble with it.[2]

These traditions bear evidence that on the basis of God's blessing and power the Prophet caused many sick to recover and this sudden healing of the sick clearly contrasts with the normal conduct of nature and this is a miracle. The Prophet always regarded such blessings as conferred by God and in the light of this basic dictum the traditions relating to the miracles need to be interpreted.

Al-Kulaynī does not differ from al-Bukhārī on this aspect of the miracles and believes that it is in God's Power that at times He may break the normal conduct of the universe and may honour and support His Apostles. Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as transmitting the event of Ibrāhīm's stepping in fire, to which we have already referred,[2a] as follows:

> The earth said: 'O my Lord! there is no one on my back except Ibrāhīm who worships you. Would he be burnt?' The Lord said: 'If he will make a supplication I shall save him.' Ibrāhīm then prayed to his Lord, praised Him and said: 'I resign my affair to God'. God then said: 'You are saved': and He said to the fire: 'Be cold'.[3]

Al-Kulaynī in another chapter reports from the Prophet that if anyone says: 'I resign my affair to the Living Who will never die' his poverty and sickness will be removed.[4] This apparently contrasts the general conduct of the healing of the sick and suggests how God honours His Prophets and over-rules the normal conduct of the universe. Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as transmitting:

1. ibid, v.5, p.171.
2. ibid, v.5, p.170. 2a. See. P. 158.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.369.
4. ibid, v.8, p.93.

> Verily the Apostle of God, while in the Cave, faced towards Abū Bakr saying to him: 'Keep tranquil, surely God is with us'; and shuddering had overcome him (Abū Bakr) and he was not keeping tranquil. When the Prophet observed this state he said to him, 'Would you like to see my Companions from among the Anṣār talking in their companies?' I shall make you see Ja'far and his companions plunging into water. Abū Bakr agreed to see that. The Prophet passed his hand over his face and he (Abū Bakr) saw the Anṣār talking to each other and he looked towards Ja'far and his companions plunging into water.[1]

This report clearly states that the Prophet Muḥammad was endowed with Divine support and that on the basis of God's Power he, at times, showed miracles in contrast to the normal conduct of nature.

10. The particular qualities of the Prophethood of Muḥammad.

i. The International Prophethood.

According to Islām Muḥammad had been raised from among the Arabs for all the nations of the world. His mission was not restricted to the Arabs only but he has been as warner to all those to whom his message reaches. The Qur'ān says:

> 'Blessed is He Who sent down the Distinction (The Qur'ān) upon His servant that he may be a warner to the nations.'[2]

> 'And we have not sent you but to all men as a bearer of good news and as a warner, but most men do not know.'[3]

> 'Say God is witness between you and me; and this Qur'ān has been revealed to me that with it I may warn you and whomsoever it reaches.'[4]

> Say O people! Surely I am to all of you the Apostle of God to whom belongs the Kingdom of the Heavens and the earth, there is no God but He, He brings to life and causes to die.[5]

The first addressees of the Prophet were the people of Mecca and its suburbs whose language was Arabic and from them his

1. ibid, v.8, pp.262-3.
2. S 25:1.
3. S 34:28.
4. S 6:19.
5. S 7:158.

mission extended to all those whom the Qur'ān reached. The Qur'ān states the cause of its revelation in Arabic as follows:

> 'And thus we revealed to you an Arabic Qur'ān, that you may warn (the people of) the mother-city and its suburbs and that you may give warning of the day of gathering together wherein is no doubt.'[1]

In consideration of the first four passages of the Qur'ān this verse does not suggest that the message of the Qur'ān was limited to the mother-city and its suburbs.[2]

It is a fact that the 25th Sūrah of the Qur'ān Al-Shūrā was revealed at Mecca and in those days the Prophet was warning the people of the mother-city and its suburbs; but in principle his message was not restricted to them, and he was extending his message to all those whom the Qur'ān reaches. Al-An'ām, the sixth Sūrah from which the third passage has been given was also revealed at Mecca when the Prophet was in fact addressing the men of the mother-city and its suburbs. During his stay at Mecca he never addressed the people as: 'O people of Mecca': or: 'O people of Arabia': but the Qur'ān generally addresses them as: 'O you men'. This harmonises with the other passages of the Qur'ān. The verse of Al-Shūrā discusses the cause of its having been revealed in Arabic and does not restrict his mission to Mecca. The Prophet was at Mecca when some people of Medina had reached there and embraced Islām which suggests that his message was not restricted to the mother-city. Bilāl, the Companion, who was a foreigner and not amongst the people of Mecca and its suburbs, had also embraced Islām in the very early days of Islām.

When the Prophet migrated to Medina he did not restrict his message to the Arabic speaking countries but he wrote letters to rulers of all the well-known nations calling them to Islām. Al-Bukhārī in the sixth tradition of his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ discusses this issue and the reports of the Prophet's letter

1. S 42:7.
2. We do not agree with Wensinck that the Qur'ān restricts the mission of Muḥammad to the mother-city and its suburbs and the view that Muḥammad conceived his mission as a universal one is naturally derived from the Muslim tradition. See, A.J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, pp.6-7.

to Heraclius.

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Al-Bukhārī reports Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> I have been given five things which no one before me has been given; I have been helped by a commanding personality (terror being put in the hearts of the enemies) which extends as far as a month's journey away; the earth has been made for me a place of worship and a means of ceremonial purification, so that when the time of prayer comes any one of my people may pray; spoils have been made lawful to me which had not been made lawful to anyone before me; I have been granted the right of intercession; and (finally) whereas Prophets were formerly sent to their people alone, I have been sent to all mankind.[1]

Muslim reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet that the Jews and the Christians were all the addressees of the Prophet. We differ from Caetani who believed that Muḥammad never tried to convert Jews or Christians.[2] The Prophet says:

> By Him in Whose hand Muḥammad's soul is possessed, anyone of this people, Jew or Christian, who hears of me and then dies without belief in my apostleship will be among the people of hell.[3]

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) comments:

> In this tradition there is abrogation by the apostleship of our Prophet of all the religions and there is evidence in this report that one whom his (the Prophet's) call to Islam has not received is to be excused.[4]

Al-Bukhārī further reports the Prophet as saying:

> I have been commissioned with words which are concise but comprehensive in meaning; I have been helped by commanding personality; and while I was asleep I saw myself being brought the keys of the treasures of the earth which were placed in my hand.[5]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, pp.91-2.
2. See, A.J. Wensinck, op.cit., p.50.
3. Muslim, op.cit., v.1, p.93.
4. Al-Nawawī, op.cit., v.1, p.86.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.65; v.9, pp.43, 47.

Muslim reports Thawbān, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet that his people will attain to rule over the earth. The Prophet says:

> God gathered together the earth for me and I saw its eastern and western parts; and my people will attain to rule over it so far as it was gathered together for me.[1]

(b) The approach of al-Kulaynī

Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> Verily God, the Mighty, the Glorified, sent Muḥammad as Apostle to all of the people and established him as Authority for all His creation on His earth.[2]

Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq (381 A.H.) reports the Prophet as transmitting the following Ḥadīth Qudsī from God:

> O Muḥammad! I have sent every Apostle to his people in their own language and I have sent you to all my people, the white and black, and I have helped you by commanding personality (terror put in the hearts of the enemies) with which I had not helped anyone else; and I made the spoils lawful to you which had not been allowed for anyone before you; and I conferred upon you (revealed to you) a treasure from the treasures of my Throne and these are Al-Fātiḥah and the ending of Al-Baqarah; and I made the whole of the earth as a place of worship and its earth as a means for ceremonial purification; and favoured you with takbīr (Glorification of God); and I united your mention with my mention, so that no one remembers me from your people but he mentions you with his mentioning of me. It is a blessing for you and your people.[3]

Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (404 A.H.) reports ʿAlī, the First Imām, as saying:

> Verily God sent Muḥammad as a Warner for all the nations and a trustee for the revelation.[4]

Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ (1091 A.H.) states:

> The prophethood of our Prophet Muḥammad is general for all people as God says: And we have not sent you but for all mankind.[5]

1. Muslim, op.cit., v.8, p. 171.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.181.
3. Al-Ṣuddūq, Maʿānī al-Akhbār, p.51.
4. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.1, p.62.
5. Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ, Minhāj al-Nijāt, p.279.

ii. The seal of the Prophets after whom there is no Prophet to be born.

The Muslims accept Muḥammad as the seal of the Prophets after whom there is no Prophet to be born. This is considered as a fundamental belief of Islām which admits no contrary interpretation. If someone believes in Muḥammad's prophethood but does not admit him as having terminated the Chain of Prophets the general body of the Muslims, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs, establish him as an unbeliever. The descent (second coming) of ʿĪsā does not contradict this as he will not be a new-born Prophet after Muḥammad but the same one who was born long before Muḥammad and had ascended to the Heavens. The Qurʾān says:

> Muḥammad is not (physically) the father of any of your men, but he is the Apostle of God and the seal of the Prophets and God is Cognizant of all things.[1]

Al-Tirmidhī reports Anas b. Mālik, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> Verily the apostleship and the prophethood have ended; so there is no Apostle after me and no Prophet ....[2]

He further reports Thawbān, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> There will be among my people thirty great liars, each of them asserting that he is the Prophet of God, whereas I am the seal of the Prophets after whom there will be no Prophet.[3]

Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī (403 A.H.) comments:

> Verily when our Prophet said: There will be no Prophet after me: he recited the word of God: and (Muḥammad is) the seal of the Prophets: and he cleared it out from any context which establishes the acceptance of any other Prophet after him; and he made it obligatory to reject anyone who claims prophecy after him or in his own time....

1. S 33:40.
2. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.44.
3. ibid, v.2, p.39.

> All of his people have transmitted his statement that there would be no Prophet after him with such a celebrity that it is impossible to reject this doctrine and it is established in his religion that everyone who claims to be an Apostle after him is liable to the punishment of death.[1]

Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhīr al-Baghdādī (429 A.H.) corroborates:

> Verily Muḥammad is the Khātam, the seal of the Prophets and the reports that there is no Prophet after him have reached celebrity and one who rejects the Qurʾān and the Sunnah is an unbeliever.[2]

Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (505 A.H.) states:

> Verily the Community has by consensus and by the contexts of the Prophetic affairs (wherever he stated that there would be no Prophet after him) considered this word Khātam al-Nabīyīn as establishing that there will never be any nabī after him and no rasūl after him and that there is no other interpretation to this and no particularisation of it.[3]

Qāḍī ʿIyaḍ al-Mālikī (544 A.H.) comments:

> All the community has agreed to regard these words for their apparent meaning and they assert that this is the purported meaning of it, without any other interpretation or any particularisation. So there is no doubt that these people who do not regard these words in their apparent meaning have committed unbelief and this is certain by consensus and by report.[4]

The Shīʿī traditionist al-Ṣuddūq (381 A.H.) refutes the explanation that there would be no Prophet after the Prophethood of Muḥammad and asserts that the tradition means that there would be no Prophet after his death. Al-Ṣuddūq is explaining the status of ʿAlī as Hārūn of this community and as having been so established even after the death of the Prophet Muḥammad. In this context he mentions the consensus of the community that there would be no Prophet after him. He writes:

1. Al-Bāqillanī, Kitāb al-Tamhīd, pp.182-183.
2. Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir, op.cit., p.163.
3. Al-Ghazālī, Al-Iqtiṣād, p.146.
4. Qadi ʿIyāḍ, Al-Shifāʾ, p.362.

> So if it is said that all the Muslims agree that the statement of the Prophet that: 'There would be no Prophet after me' means that 'There will be no Prophet after my death to the Last Day', it should be said to him that this is to be noticed in all the reports and the traditions in which it is suggested that there would be no Prophet after him.[1]

Al-Majlisī comments:

> It is agreed upon that one who believes that after our Prophet there could be one on whom revelation comes down has done wrong and committed unbelief; and this is on the basis of the certain knowledge that this tenet is an essential of the religion of the Prophet.[2]

Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ (1091 A.H.) corroborates this belief as follows:

> And our Prophet is Muhammad and he is the Chief Prophet, the best of them and their seal after whom there is no Prophet and there is no change in his religion, and no alteration in his Sharī'ah (Law).[3]

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Al-Bukhārī reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> The Banū Isrā'īl were governed by the Prophets, as often as one died another taking his place; verily there will be no Prophet after me but there will be Caliphs and they will be numerous.

They asked what command he had to give? The Prophet said:

> Fulfil the oath of allegiance to each and give them their due; for God will question them about what He asked them to guard.[4]

The Prophets who governed the Banū Isrā'īl were not independent Prophets but they judged in accordance with the Law given by Mūsā. The Qur'ān says:

> Surely We revealed the Tawrāh, in which was guidance and light; by it the Prophets who submitted themselves to God judged for those who were the Jews.[5]

1. Al-Ṣuddūq, op.cit., p.78.
2. Al-Majlisī, Mir'at al-'Uqūl, v.1, p.136, al-Majlisī, Haqq al-Yaqīn, p.335.
3. Mullā al-Fayḍ, op.cit., p.278.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.206.
5. S 5:44.

The declaration of the Prophet in the preceding context that there will be no Prophet after him suggests that there is no longer any possibility even of Prophets who administer the Law of Muḥammad and establish themselves as being under the Central prophethood of Muḥammad; but Khilāfah is the only form of succession.to the Prophet.

Al-Bukhārī reports that when the Prophet went to Tabūk and left ʿAlī behind and the latter asked him whether he was leaving him for the children and the women, the Prophet said:

> Are you not happy that you are in the same position with relation to me as Hārūn was with relation to Mūsā; but there will be no Prophet after me.[1]

Hārūn was not an independent Prophet but under the Law of Mūsā;this suggests that such types of Prophethood have been ended.

Al-Bukhārī further reports the Prophet as saying:

> I have five names. I am Muḥammad, I am Aḥmad, I am al-Māḥī (the obliterator) by whom God obliterates infidelity, I am al-Ḥāshir (the gatherer), who will gather mankind at his feet, I am al-ʿĀqib (the last in succession).[2]

Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as saying:

> The way in which I may be compared with the Prophets is that a man built a house; he constructed it beautifully and adorned it nicely; but in a corner a gap for (one brick was left unfilled). The people went round admiring the beauty of its construction but asking why the brick had not been placed in that gap? (The Prophet said) I am like the brick and I am the seal of the Prophets.[3]

The Prophet further predicts that there will be pretenders to prophecy and that then there will be the last day. Abū Hurayrah reports the Prophet as saying:

> The last hour will not come before two parties fight together; the fight between the two parties which make an equal claim will be great; and the last hour will not come before about

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.6, p.3.
2. ibid, v.4, p.225.
3. ibid, v.4, p.226.

> thirty lying dajjāl (the deceivers) are sent forth, each of them asserting that he is the Apostle of God.[1]

Al-Bukhārī reports ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, as saying:

> Verily in the time of the Prophet some of the people were interrupted (checked) by the revelation; and verily the revelation has come to an end. Now we interrupt you by that which appears to us from your actions. So one who brings apparent good is secured and is near to us, and we are not concerned with the affairs of the heart.[2]

Muslim reports that after the death of the Prophet Abū Bakr and ʿUmar visited Umm Ayman and she was weeping. They asked what made her weep? Did she not know that what was with God was better for the Prophet? She replied:

> I am not weeping because I do not know that what is with God, the Exalted, is better for the Apostle of God, but I am weeping because the revelation from Heaven has come to an end.[3]

She then stirred them to weep and they wept along with her. Al-Bukhārī reports Ibn Abī Awfā, the Companion, as saying:

> If it was decreed that there would be a Prophet after Muḥammad his son (Ibrāhīm) would have been alive but there will be no Prophet after him.[4]

1. ibid, v.4, p.243; v.9, p.74.
2. ibid, v.3, p.221.
3. Muslim, op.cit., v.7, p.145., al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.548.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.54. This is the correct version of the statement. Ibn Mājah (273 A.H.) transmits a similar tradition in a different version which gives an idea of the continuity of the prophethood: If Ibrāhīm had been alive, he would certainly have been a true Prophet: (Al-Sunan, v.1, p.237). Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) attacks this statement and declares it to be a forgery (Al-Nawawī, Tahdhīb al-Asmā', v.1, p.103). Ibn ʿArabī remarks: No one of his sons lived as it had been decreed in God's knowledge that he was the seal of the Prophets (Al-Futuḥāt al-Makkīyah, v.3, p.513).

Al-Bāqillānī (403 A.H.) gives a very comprehensive statement:

> The report has come from the Prophet and all of the Ummah (community) has made report of his statement: There will be no Prophet after me: and they have also reported from their early scholars, and they from their masters, tracing this back to those who had seen the Prophet, that the Prophet laid stress on this statement of his and exempted it from any context likely to particularise it; and brought it together with everything which established the certainty of its general purport, rejecting all the Prophets after him whether they claim to repeal his Law or whether they asserted that they were not repealing the Law; whether they might be from the Arabs or from the others; whether they might be in his own time or after his death, up to the time when all of the earth and all those who are on it enter the Possession of God and He is the best Possessor.[1]

(b) The approach of al-Kulaynī.

Al-Kulaynī reports on the authority of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, that some of the Quraysh asked the Prophet how he was regarded as the first of the Prophets when he had been raised up as the last of the Prophets and the Seal of the Prophets. The Prophet answered:

> I am the first who believed in my Lord and the first to affirm when God asked for the compact of the Prophets and made them bear witness against their own souls and asked them: 'Am I not your Lord?' So I was the first Prophet who answered in the affirmative.[2]

Mūsā Kāẓim, the Seventh Imām (183 A.H.), states:

> There are three aspects of our knowledge: The Past, the Written, and the New. The Past is elaborated, the Written is to occur and the New is thrown into the hearts and sounded in the ears; and it is the most excelled element of our knowledge; and there is no Prophet after our Prophet.[3]

1. Al-Bāqillānī, op.cit., p.181.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.10.
3. ibid, v.1, p.264.

The eminent Shīʿī traditionist of the third century of Islām, Furāt b. Ibrāhīm,[1] reports the Prophet as addressing ʿAlī, the First Imām, as follows:

> By the One who sent me with the truth you are in the same position with relation to me as Ḥarūn was with relation to Mūsā, but there will be no Prophet after me.[2]

Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq corroborates this report mentioning Hārūn in this context.[3]

ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, reports the Prophet as mentioning Hārūn in this context. It suggests that according to the Shīʿī Faith the Prophethood, with which Hārūn was endowed, has also come to an end. Al-Kulaynī reports the Prophet as saying:

> Verily ʿAlī is in the same position with relation to me as Hārūn was with relation to Mūsā but there will be no Prophet after me.[4]

ʿAlī further states:

> Beware! there is no Prophet after Muḥammad.[5]

Al-Ṣuddūq further reports Mūsā Kāẓim, the Seventh Imām, speaking of Tuesday as follows:

> It is the day when the Prophet passed away and on that day the revelation came to an end.[6]

When the Prophethood came to an end the Chapter of Khilāfah and Imāmah was opened.

1. Furāt was the teacher of Abū al-Qāsim al-Husayn and the latter was the teacher of ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, the teacher of al-Kulaynī. Al-Qummī mentions Furāt in his commentary on the Qurʾān. (v.2, p.324).
2. Furāt, Tafsīr, p.82.
3. Al-Ṣuddūq, op.cit., p.78, Kitāb al-Amālī, 153.
4. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, pp.26, 107.
5. ibid, v.8, p.68.
6. Al-Ṣuddūq, Kitāb al-Khiṣāl, v.2, p.26.

He reports on the authority of Abū Umāmah that the Prophet said:

> O people! there is no Prophet after me and no Ummah after you; so worship your God and offer the five Ṣalāh and keep fasting during your month of fasting and perform pilgrimage to the House of your Lord and pay Zakāh of your wealth.[1]

Al-Kulaynī reports al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, as saying:

> The Imāmah is particularly in the descendants of ʿAlī up to the last Day, as there will be no Prophet after Muḥammad.[2]

Al-Bāqir and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq both say:

> Indeed God ended the (Divine) Books by your Book and brought the Prophets to end by your Prophet.[3]

ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful says:

> God sent the Prophet after all the Prophets and by him brought the revelation to an end.[4]
>
> The prophethood was completed with our Prophet Muḥammad.[5]

When he (ʿAlī) was giving the funeral bath to the Prophet he said:

> May my father and mother be a sacrifice for you, O Prophet of God! Verily by your death the Prophethood, the News and the heavenly messages have come to an end but these had never been ended by the death of any other than you.[6]

Al-Ṣuddūq transmits another tradition of the Prophet as follows:

> God named me al-ʿĀqib (the last); I am the last of the Prophets; after me there is no Apostle.[7]

1. ibid, v.1, p.156.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.200.
3. ibid, v.1, p.177.
4. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.2, p.22.
5. ibid, v.1, p.177.
6. ibid, v.2, p.255.
7. Al-Ṣuddūq, Maʿānī al-Akhbār, p.51.

Al-Kulaynī reports on the authority of ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, that Nūḥ also mentioned the Prophet as being the Chief of the Prophets and the Seal of the Prophets.[1] He reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> Verily God, Whose dhikr (commemoration) is glorified, has caused an end to the Prophets by your Prophet; so that there will be no Prophet after him for ever; and by your Book He has caused an end to the (Divine) Books, so there will be no Book after it (the Qurʾān) for ever. He revealed therein the mention of everything; the creation of you and the creation of the heavens and the earth; and the reports of your past and the decision of what is happening to you and the news of what will be after you.[2]

These reports reach the status of celebrity and there is no provision for any other interpretation to them; and there is consensus of the Community and agreement of the two Major Schools, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs, that no type of Prophethood is continuing after the Prophet.

In the light of the material presented in this Chapter the Sunnīs and Shīʿīs agree with each other in regard to most of the general qualities of the Apostleship. Both believe that there are different categories of Messengers and that their functions are different. Both Schools believe that the Apostles are human beings endowed with Divine light, infallible in the performance of the duties entrusted to them, sinless in their lives, and that they are basically unanimous in calling mankind to believe in God and seek salvation in the hereafter. The Sunnīs and Shīʿīs also agree on the particular qualities of Muḥammad, i.e. that his message is universal, meant for all nations and that he is the last of the Prophets after whom no Prophet will be born.

In spite of this basic agreement they, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs, differ in regard to two points. Firstly, whether the necessity of peoples' recognition of God is based on God's revelation to His Apostles, or whether it is reason which requires human beings to recognise their Creator. The Sunnīs, as has been discussed

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.237.
2. ibid, v.1, p.269.

in detail, maintain the first, and the Shī'īs favour the second opinion. They differed so radically that their variant attitudes towards the Nuṣūṣ, which have been discussed in the second Chapter, seem also a result of this basic difference of opinion. Secondly, they differ as to whether Divine revelation is a benefit of God, as the Sunnīs say, or whether there is an obligation on the part of God to send His Apostles, as the Shī'īs say.

Apart from these two basic issues they agree with each other and both consider it obligatory for all mankind to recognise and admit the Apostles sent to them. It is also a part of Faith to accept (without question) all that comes from the Apostles. It is true that they differ in regard to the Prophet's succession but this is not really a matter of any aspect of the Apostleship. There is Khilāfah or Imāmah after the Prophet and after him all affairs of Religion are connected with these offices.

Chapter IV. THE IMĀMAH IN ISLĀM.

1. The Succession to the Prophet.

The question of succession to the Prophet is treated under the subject of Imāmah. There are two chief aspects of the Prophet's life; firstly he received the revelation from God and conveyed His message with its proper explanation to the people and secondly he administered their affairs as head of state. He worked in this second aspect as an Imām of the community. In this context al-Bukhārī mentions the Prophet as Imām[1] in his various Chapter-headings.

When the Prophethood came to an end and the last of the Prophets passed away the one who was entrusted with the responsibilities of this second aspect of the Prophet's life and took the rein of affairs in his hand was known as an Imām or 'the Commander of the Faithful'.

i. The implied meaning of the Imāmah.

In Islām the word Imām is not only a technical term like the word nabī; nabī is never used in its purely literal sense but is always related to Divine relationship, whereas the word Imām on the other hand has a wide range of applications and in its general use covers even wicked leaders. The Qur'ān says:

> And We made them Imāms (leaders) who called to the fire, and on the day of resurrection they shall not be favoured.[2]

Al-Kulaynī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

> There are two kinds of Imāms in the Book of God; the Imām who calls to God and the Imām who calls to the fire.[3]

In this state of usage it depends upon the context of the affair to determine whether it is used in its literal sense or whether it is used in a technical sense.

1. See, al-Bukhārī, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, v.4, p.84; p.60; v.9, pp.86, 92, 95, 96, 102.
2. S 28:41.
3. Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, v.1, p.215. ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (307 A.H.) also states a category of the Imāms who call to hell (See, Tafsīr, v.2, p.171).

ii. Ulū al-Amr, the men of Authority.

As to the pious succession of the Prophet, the Qur'ān's particular word is ulū al-Amr (the men of Authority) and both the Sunnīs and the Shī'īs mention the ulū al-Amr for the successors of the Prophet. The Qur'ān says:

> O you who believe! Obey God and obey the Apostle and those in authority from among you; then if you fall into dispute (with them) about anything, refer it to God (the Qur'an) and the Prophet (the Sunnah) if you believe in God and the Last Day.[1]

Al-Bukhārī opens his discussion[2] on the point at issue with reference to this verse of the Qur'ān. He lays down the principle that ulū al-Amr are the successors of the Prophet. Al-Kulaynī also holds that pious succession to the Prophet rests in the Imāms and they are really the ulū al-Amr.[3]

iii. The word Khilāfah for the pious succession.

The Qur'ān mentions this word in the context of pious succession to the Prophet:

> God has promised to those of you who believe and do good that He will most certainly make them Caliphs in the earth.[4]

Al-Bukhārī says that when the Prophethood came to an end and the Prophet passed away it was the Khilāfah which provided the succession to the Prophethood.[5] Al-Kulaynī also believes that the Caliphs are nothing but Imāms.[6]

However the words Imām, ulū al-Amr and Khalīfah all, in their general use, are synonymous terms and all explain the succession to the Prophet although the Shī'īs lay stress on the first and the Sunnīs on the third; and the second is commonly used among both the Schools.

1. S 4:59.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.77.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.94.
4. S 24:55.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v. 4, p.206.
6. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v. 1, p.193.

2. The question as to whether the commandments are authoritative or the ulū al-Amr themselves.

One may ask whether the ulū al-Amr are themselves an Authority or whether the real Authority is the commandments of the Qur'ān and the Prophet. Al-Bukhārī lays down a main heading Kitāb al-Aḥkām (The Book of Commandments), and mentions the verse stating the ulū al-Amr as being successors to the Prophet therein;[1] and hereby he suggests that the real binding authorities are the commandments of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah whereas the ulū al-Amr provide the enforcing authority and the administration. They may commit errors against the injunctions of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, in which they are not to be obeyed;[2] and the matter is to be referred to the Book and the Sunnah. Al-Bukhārī does not establish the ulū al-Amr as being an authority in themselves whereas al-Kulaynī believes that the ulū al-Amr are themselves an Authority and he lays down a Chapter-heading on the point at issue as follows:

> Kitāb al-Ḥujjah[3]: the Book relating to attesting authority.

Al-Kulaynī establishes that the Imām is an authority himself and not only an interpreter of the Book and the Sunnah.

The Shī'īs regard the Imāmah as being one of the fundamentals of Islām. Muḥammad al-Bāqir al-Majlisī states:

> It should be known that according to the Shī'īs it is a fundamental of Religion to admit the Imām as being an Authority, the rejection of which associates one with the unbelievers in the hereafter.[4]

The Sunnīs disagree with it and regard the Imāmah as a fundamental of administration and not as a fundamental

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.77.
2. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar reports the Prophet as saying : 'Hearing and obeying (the ulū al-Amr) are the duty of a Muslim both regarding what he likes and what he dislikes, as long as he is not commanded (by the ulū al-Amr) to perform an act of disobedience to God, in which they must not be heard nor be obeyed. (ibid, v.9, p.78).
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.168.
4. Al-Majlisī, Ḥayāt al-Qulūb, v.3, p.28.

of Religion; and argue that the Religion had already been perfected and completed in the life-time of the Prophet while the administrative affairs continue up to the last hour.

3. The question as to when the Religion attained perfection and completion.

In order to ascertain whether the succession to the Prophet is a matter of administration only or whether it is an essential part of Religion, one needs verification as to when the Religion was declared as completed. The Qur'ān says:

> This day I have perfected for you your Religion and completed My favour on you and chosen for you Islām as a religion.[1]

Al-Bukhārī reports ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, as saying:

> Verily I do know when it was revealed and where it was revealed and where the Prophet was when it was revealed; it was revealed on the Day of ʿArafah (the ninth of Dhū al-Hijjah) and verily by God we were at ʿArafāt at that time.[2]

Al-Kulaynī admits that it was revealed on the Day of the Farewell Pilgrimage of the Prophet. He reports al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, as speaking in the Jāmiʿ Mosque of Marw as follows:

> Verily, God, the Mighty and the Glorified, did not cause death to His Prophet until He had perfected for him the Religion; and had revealed to him the Qur'ān in which there is a statement of everything. He had explained therein completely what was the lawful and the unlawful, the prescribed punishments and the commandments and everything that the people required; the Mighty and the Glorified says: 'We have not neglected anything in the Book, then to their Lord they shall be gathered;'[3] and on the Farewell Pilgrimage which was in the last days of his life He had revealed: 'This day I have perfected for you your Religion and completed My favour on you and chosen for you Islām as a religion;' and the affair of Imāmah is the completion of the Religion. The Prophet

1. S 5:3.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.6, p.63.
3. S 6:38.

> did not pass away until he explained to his people the signs of their Religion and elaborated for them their path and left them on the moderate path of truth and established for them ʿAlī as emblem and Imām.[1]

This speech corroborates the statement of al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, that the verse which declares the perfection of the Religion and the completion of God's favour was revealed on the Friday at ʿArafāt.[2] Al-Bāqir, the Imām, says that God communicated through this verse:

> I will not reveal to you any other obligatory thing after this verse; I have perfected all the obligatory things for you.[3]

It should also be noted here that, according to the report of al-Kulaynī, the Prophet declared the Imāmah of ʿAlī on the Day of Ghadīr Khumm[4] and it was the eighteenth of Dhū al-Ḥijjah.

This indicates that up to the ninth of Dhū al-Ḥijjah there was no elaboration as to who was to be the Imām after the Prophet. On this ground the Sunnīs do not admit the Imāmah as being part and parcel of the Religion but they take it as a medium of administration; and they do not even admit that the succession of ʿAlī was declared at Ghadīr Khumm on the eighteenth of Dhū al-Hijjah.

It is noteworthy that the Shīʿī traditionists make another report that the verse declaring the perfection of the Religion was revealed (on the eighteenth of Dhu al-Ḥijjah) at Ghadīr Khumm.[5] According to this the so-claimed Imāmah of ʿAlī becomes to be a part and parcel of Religion. However we shall discuss it under the heading 'the establishment of the Imāmah'. The detail given here shows that from the Shīʿī point of view the Imāmah is more important

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.199.
2. ibid, v.1, p.290.
3. ibid, v.1, p.289.
4. ibid. v.1, p.289.
5. See, al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.21.

than appears from its position among the Sunnīs.

4. The functions of the Imāms.

The eminent Sunnī scholastic theologian Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) states the position and function of the Imām as follows:

> The Muslims cannot do without an Imām who is to carry out the administration of their affairs; the enforcing of their restrictive ordinances and guarding their frontiers, and equipping their armies and receiving their alms, and putting down robberies and thieving and highwaymen and maintaining the Friday services and the Festivals, and the settlement of disputes which occur between people, the receiving of evidence based on legal rights and marrying minors, male and female, who have no guardians, and the division of the booty.[1]

Al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) defines Imāmah as follows:

> It is the supreme leadership in (all the affairs of) Religion and the world in succession to the Prophet.[2]

Al-Majlisī also defines the Imām on the same lines:

> The Imām is one who is the leader and Commander of the Community in all the affairs of the World and Religion in succession, but as subordinate to the Prophet and not as an independent one.[3]

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī:

We have already stated that the Sunnīs take Imāmah as a medium of administration and believe it as to be linked mainly with the practical affairs of the State. Al-Bukhārī reports the Prophet as saying:

> The Banū Isrā'īl were governed by the Prophets; as often as one died another succeeded him; verily there will be no Prophet after me but there will be Caliphs and they will be numerous.4

1. Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī, Al-ʿAqā'id, p.181.
2. See, Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, Radd al-Muḥtār, v.1, p.511 (with ref. to Al-Maqāṣid).
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.20.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.206.

This report suggests that the Caliphs are the Successors of the Prophet and apart from the administration of the Prophet's mission according to his instructions there is no other function of the Imāmah. Sunnis regard the words Imām, Khalīfah and Amīr as synonymous terms. Al-Bukhārī further reports the Prophet as saying:

> He who obeys me has obeyed God and he who disobeys me has disobeyed God; and he who obeys the Amīr (Commander) has obeyed me and he who disobeys the Amīr has disobeyed me. The Imām is only a shield behind whom fighting is engaged in and by whom protection is sought; so if he commands piety and acts justly he will have a reward for that, and if he holds another view he will on that account be held guilty.[1]

Al-Bukhārī, by this tradition, suggests the following points; the words Amīr and Imām are synonymous terms; the Imām is not necessarily protected from sin and it is possible that he may hold an unjust view; the Imām is not directly related to God but he represents the Prophet; the Imām is one who takes the rein of all the affairs in his hands and therefore it is not lawful to fight against the unbelievers unless there is an Imām who is in command.

This belief of al-Bukhārī is more elaborately depicted in these Chapter-headings:

> The Imām goes to the people and makes them reconciled with each other;[2] The Imām checks his governors;[3] The advice of the Imām to the disputing parties;[4] How the Imām takes the pledge from the people;[5] Complete obedience to the Imāms;[6] Fighting is engaged in under the command of the Imām, and with him protection is sought;[7] The Imām is appointed so that obedience should be given to him;[8] It is lawful for the Imām to depend upon what the people say if he falls under suspicion.[9]

1. ibid, v.4, p.60, Muslim, Al-Sahih, v.6, p.17.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.92.
3. ibid, v.9, p.75.
4. ibid, v.9, p.86.
5. ibid, v.9, p196.
6. ibid, v.4, p.60.
7. ibid, v.4, p.60.
8. ibid, v.1, p.175.
9. ibid, v.1, p.183.

There are numerous such Chapter-headings which indicate that the Imām governs all the party-affairs of his people whether they relate to the prayers, public dealings, or the country's affairs. There is no demarcation between Mosque and the State affairs. This is a complete form of succession to the Prophet with the exception that he does not directly receive any command from God as the revelation has come to an end. Al-Bukhārī further reports the Prophet as stating the responsibility of the Imām as follows:

> Beware! Each of you is a shepherd and each of you is responsible for his flock. The Imām who is over the people is a shepherd and is responsible for his flock.[1]

Muslim corroborates the doctrine of al-Bukhārī that it is possible that the Imām may do wrong and commit a sin. In spite of this the Prophet establishes it as necessary that they should be obeyed so long as they are Muslims provided they do not command one to disobey God. ʿAwf b. Mālik al-Ashjaʿī, the Companion (73 A.H.) reports the Prophet as saying:

> Your best Imāms are those whom you like and who like you, on whom you invoke blessing and who invoke blessings on you; and your worst Imāms are those whom you hate and they hate you, whom you curse and they curse you.

The Companions asked the Prophet whether in that event they should not depose them by the sword? The Prophet replied:

> No, as long as they observe the prayer. Whenever you see your governors doing anything which you do not like, you should disapprove of it, but do not withdraw from obedience to them (in affairs other than that.)[2]

We shall discuss this issue further under the heading: <u>The principles of the appointment of an Imām and his dismissal</u>.

1. <u>ibid</u>, v.9, p.77.
2. Muslim, <u>op. cit.</u>, v.6, p.24.

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī.

Al-Kulaynī admits, in principle, that the Imāms are the Caliphs. He reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as explaining the following verse of the Qurʾān:

> God has promised to those of you who believe and do good that He will most certainly make them Caliphs in the earth as He made those before them Caliphs.[1]

The Imām says that the Caliphs are nothing but Imāms.[2] We have already discussed this;[2a] here we make the point that the basic conception of Imāmah, with which the Sunnīs also agree, is that the rein of the State affairs must be in the hands of the Imām.

(a) The administrative aspect of the Imāmah.

Al-Kulaynī reports Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, as corroborating the statement of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq that the Imāms are the Caliphs of God on His earth.[3] The Imām further states:

> Verily the Imāmah is the stage of the Prophets and it is the legacy of the legation; verily the Imāmah is the Khilāfah of God and the Khilāfah of the Prophet and it is the rank of the Commander of the Faithful (ʿAlī) and the inheritance of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn; verily the Imāmah is the rein of the Religion and the organisation of the Muslims and it is the good of the world and the honour of the believers; verily the Imāmah is the basis of the Extending of Islām and its product of high rank.
> By the Imām comes the perfection of the prayer, the giving of the alms, the keeping of the fast, the performance of the Ḥajj and the engagement of jihād (holy war), the sharing of the booty and the alms, the enforcement of the penal ordinances and the safeguard of the boundaries and the limits. The Imām expresses what is lawful from God and disallows what is forbidden by Him; he enforces the ordinances of God and safeguards the Religion of God and calls to the path of God by wisdom and good advice and conclusive argument.[3, 4]

1. S 24:55.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.194. 2a. See, p. 177.
3. ibid, v.1, p.193.
4. ibid, v.1, p.200.

This report elaborates the duties of the Imām and it corroborates the statement of al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām; the Imām was asked what was the right of the Imām over the people? The Imam answered that they should hear him and obey him. He was further asked what was their right over the Imām? The Imām replied:

> He should make an equal division among the public and act justly between them. When this has been done among the people he need not care who took from this side and who took from that side.[1]

Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (404 A.H.) agrees with al-Kulaynī and reports ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as stating the function of the Amīr of the believers:

> It is essential for the people to have an Amīr, pious or impious, in whose government the believer may work and an unbeliever also may avail himself of the same opportunity and God may cause the affairs reaching their end; by him spoils are collected and the enemy is confronted, and by him the ways are made peaceful, and by him the right of the weak is secured from the strong, until the pious man is laid to rest and the public have rest from the impious.[2]

This is one aspect of the Imāmah and it is mostly related to the general administration of the public. But there is another aspect of this matter which deals with the spiritual guidance of the Imām and with his perfect knowledge in interpreting the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. We shall discuss later on how the Imām, from the Shīʿī point of view, is under Divine protection, but here we state simply that apart from the administrative work of state there is another function of the Imāmah.

(b) The spiritual aspect of the Imāmah.

It is also a function of the Imām to keep the knowledge of Religion purified and to interpret the Qur'ān according to the good pleasure of God and the will of the Prophet.

1. ibid, v.1, p.405.
2. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, Nahj al-Balāghah, v.1, p.87.

Al-Kulaynī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

> Verily the Imāms are the governors of God's command and the treasurers of His knowledge.

He then reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> We are the treasurers of God's Knowledge; we are the interpreters of the revelation of God; we are the authority for everyone who is beneath the sky and is on the earth.[1]

Al-Kulaynī further reports Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as stating the spiritual status of the Imāms referring to the following verse of the Qur'ān:

> And the signs and the warners do not avail a people who would not believe.[2]

The Imām states that the signs are the Imāms and that the Prophets are the warners.[3]

There is another report of al-Kulaynī that al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, states:

> Verily there are people among us who believe that in the verse: 'So ask the men of dhikr (remembrance) if you do not know'[4]: it is the Jews and the Christians who are the men of dhikr.

The Imām then said that they (the Jews and Christians) would call men to their own religion. He then pointed to his breast and said:

> It is we who are the men of dhikr and we are those to whom the question refers.[5]

Al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, corroborates the preceding statements of the Imāms as follows:

> We are the trustees of God on His earth.[6]

This aspect of their status does not allow the believers to fall into dispute with them. Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, comments:

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.192.
2. S 10:101.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.207.
4. S 16:43.
5. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.211.
6. ibid, v.1, p.223.

> How can God command them (the believers) to obey the governors of authority and then allow them to fall into dispute with them (the governors of authority?)[1]

However, we shall return to this issue when we discuss the qualities of the Imām among the Shīʿīs.

5. The establishment of the Imāmah among the Sunnīs.

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) states the Sunnī doctrine in this context:

> All the Muslims agree that it is obligatory for the Muslims to appoint a Caliph and the obligatory nature of this is based on Sharʿ (Law) and not on reason; and as for what is argued as not being obligatory or as based on reason, both of these are futile arguments.[2]

Muslim reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> He who throws off obedience will meet God on the day of resurrection without possessing any plea, and he who dies without having taken an oath of allegiance will die like a pagan.[3]

The eminent Ḥanafī Jurist ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn states in Al-Durr al-Mukhtār as follows:

> Imāmah has two categories: the Sughrā (the Minor) and the Kubrā (the Major). As regards the Major it is the right of general possession over the people, the verity of which is discussed in dogmatics; and the appointment of the Imām is the most important obligatory thing.[4]

The Muslims cannot do without an Imām. If there is a majority of the unbelievers and there is no Muslim ruler, even in such areas the Muslims are in need of an Imām to meet their religious requirements, to settle their affairs and to lead their Friday prayers. Ibn Hammām al-Iskandarī (861 A.H.) writes:

1. ibid, v.1, p.276.
2. Al-Nawawī, Commentary on Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, v.2, p.120.
3. Muslim, op.cit., v.6, p.22.
4. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, Al-Durr al-Mukhtār, v.1, p.511.

> If, by reason of the prevalence of unbelievers, no Muslim ruler is found, it is obligatory for the Muslims to appoint a guardian and an Imām to lead the Friday prayers.[1]

Although al-Kulaynī's conception of the Imāmah will be dealt with later on,[2] it is helpful for the understanding of the Sunnī outlook to give here a brief sketch of the Shī‘ī doctrine on this issue.

According to the Shī‘īs it is not for the people to appoint an Imām. Rather he is divinely raised and nominated by God. The Prophet introduces him and then every Imām introduces his successor. The earth cannot completely be exempt from the Imām. It is obligatory on the part of the people to recognise their Imām and this obligation is based on reason and not on the reported law.

Al-Kulaynī reports Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, as saying:

> Verily God observes more glory and greatness than to leave the earth without any just Imām.[3]

Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, states:

> By God He did not leave the earth from the time He caused death to Ādam without there being an Imām from whom guidance to God is sought; and he is His appointed authority over His servants.[4]

The Imām was further asked whether recognition of the Imām from among the Family of the Prophet was obligatory for all creation? The Imām answered:

> The recognition of the Imām from among us is obligatory for them (. human beings).[5]

The Imām further states:

> One who lived in this community without an Imām who is from God, the Glorified and the Exalted, and who is visible and just, such a one has lived as misled and troubled; and if he dies in this position he has died the death of unbelief and hypocrisy.[6]

1. ibid, v.4, p.427 (with reference to Ibn Hammām, Fatḥ al-Qadīr).
2. See p.207.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.178.
4. ibid, v.1, p.179.
5. ibid, v.1, p.181.
6. ibid, v.1, p.184.

Al-Majlisī reports the celebrity of such reports as the following:

> It has been proved by celebrity from the Prophet that one who dies but has not recognised the Imām of his time has died the death of a pagan.[1]

Al-Majlisī, having discussed that the Imām is the leader of the community in succession to the Prophet, in all the affairs of the World and in Religion, states:

> There is a dispute among the community whether the appointment of an Imām, the definition of whom has been given, is obligatory or whether it is not an obligation; and if it is obligatory then there is a dispute whether it is obligatory on the part of God or on the part of the community. It is also disputed whether the obligation for the Imām's appointment is based on reason or on the reported law. It is worthless to mention here their disputes. The saving sect of the Imāmīyah (the Shīʿīs) agree that it is obligatory on the part of God and its obligation is based on reason and report.[2]

i. The question as to whether the Prophet appointed his Successor.

Al-Bukhārī holds that the Prophet did not appoint his successor over the State and that he left it to the community to appoint an Imām. He reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.) as stating:

> ʿAlī b. Abū Ṭālib came out from the Prophet during his illness in which he expired. The people asked him: 'Abū al-Ḥasan! what was the Prophet's condition in the morning?' He answered: 'Praise be to God that he felt relief!' ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib then caught his hand and said: 'By God, after three days time you will be the 'servant of the rod (of authority)'; Verily, by God, I see that in the near future the Prophet will pass away by this illness of his; verily I recognise the faces of the descendants of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib at the time of death; let us go to the Prophet of God and ask him who will take charge of the affair. If it is for us we shall know it and if it is for others than us we would have known that and he will give some advice for us.' ʿAlī said:

1. Al-Majlisī, Mirʾat al-ʿUqūl, v.1, p.137.
2. Al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.20.

> 'Indeed, by God, if we asked the Prophet of God for it and he rejected that for us the people will never give us that after the Prophet; and I, by God, will never ask the Prophet of God for it.'[1]

This report bears evidence that up to that time the Prophet had not appointed anyone as his state-successor and that it was for the community to appoint their Imām after the Prophet.

ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, gives a very clear statement that the Prophet had not appointed any successor to himself. Al-Bukhārī reports from ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion, that ʿUmar, on his death bed, was asked if he was appointing any successor? ʿUmar answered as follows:

> If I appoint any successor, it would be lawful since one who was better than I, Abū Bakr, appointed his successor; but if I leave that, verily the one who was better than I, the Prophet of God, had left that.[2]

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) comments:

> There is evidence in this tradition that the Prophet had not made an injunction for any successor and this is agreed upon among the Sunnīs and the others. Qāḍī says that Bakr b. Ukht ʿAbd al-Wāḥid does not agree with this and believes that the Prophet had made an injunction for the succession of Abū Bakr; and Ibn Rāwandī states that the Prophet made an injunction for ʿAbbās and the Shīʿīs and the Rāfiḍīs say that he had made injunction for ʿAlī. All these claims are false and audacious scandal and barefacedness against the consensus; for the Companions agreed upon the election of Abū Bakr and upon the enforcement of his command to appoint ʿUmar, and upon the enforcement of the command of ʿUmar to appoint the council; and no one made any objection to any of these aspects; and neither ʿAlī nor ʿAbbās nor Abū Bakr claimed at any time that there was any testament of the Prophet for the appointment of any of them; and ʿAlī and ʿAbbās agreed upon all these events and there was no exigency which had prevented the mention of testament if there had been any. So if anyone believes that there was a testament for anyone of them he is suggesting that all of the community has agreed upon an error and then has

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.6, p.15; v.8, p.74.
2. ibid, v.9, p.100.

> remained in that; and it is not lawful for any of the people of the Qiblah to suggest that the Companions have agreed upon a vanity in any event.[1]

If the Prophet had made an injunction for anyone to be his successor such a one would then have held supreme power and in no case would he have been the subject of any question or verification by the people whereas the ruler who is elected by the people is always the subject of verification by the people.

There is evidence that the Prophet first intended to write down a testament but afterwards, having been instructed by God, he gave up the idea and left it to the community. Al-Bukhārī reports that ʿĀishah, the Mother of the Faithful, told that she (suffered from a headache and) said: 'O my head!' And the Prophet then said:

> If you were to die while I was alive I should ask forgiveness for you and should make supplication on your behalf.

ʿĀishah then said: 'Alas! I swear by God that I think you want me to die and if that happened you would spend the coming night with any of your wives.' The Prophet replied as follows:

> Do not worry about your head but think of me. I proposed or wished to send to Abū Bakr and and his son and to make (Abū Bakr) my successor lest people should talk, or people who hoped for the succession should raise their hopes. Then I said that God wants none else and that the believers would reject anyone else or that God will reject anyone else and that the believers want none else.[2]

Muslim reports that the Prophet spoke to ʿĀishah, the Mother of the Faithful, as follows:

> Call for me Abū Bakr, your father, and your brother, so that I may write a document, for I fear that someone may be desirous of succeeding and that one may say: 'I have most right.' Whereas God and believers will have no one but Abū Bakr.[3]

1. Al-Nawawī, op.cit., v.2, p.120.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.7, p.155; v.9, p.100.
3. Muslim, op.cit., v.7, p.110.

This statement of the Prophet bears evidence that it was his preference that the Imām should be appointed by the people and he predicted that the people would not be pleased except with Abū Bakr's appointment; and he foretold what God had decreed; and this is a prediction and not a nomination.

ii. The Muslims' affairs being a matter of counsel.

In matters for which there is no Divine injunction, affairs, being a matter of counsel, are settled by mutual consultation. If the Prophet had not appointed any successor for the state there would have been no way out for the Muslims but to take counsel among themselves. The Qur'ān says:

> And those who respond to their Lord and establish prayer and those who have affairs being a matter of counsel among themselves and who spend out of what we have given them.[1]

The Prophet himself approved the principle of mutual consultation and settled state affairs on the basis of taking counsel. The Qur'ān says:

> Pardon them (the Companions) therefore, and ask protection for them; and take counsel with them in the affair; so when you have determined (a matter), then trust in God; surely God loves those who trust.[2]

In the life-time of the Prophet an incident occurred at the battle of Mu'tah when all the Commanders who had been nominated by the Prophet were killed, one by one, and there was no nominee to take the rein of the affairs in his hand. The Muslims on the battlefield then elected Khālid b. al-Walīd as their Commander and they then achieved victory. God told the Prophet what had happened on the battlefield in his absence; and the Prophet told the Companions, before the Muslims fighting there came back to Medina. Al-Bukhārī reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion (73 A.H.), as stating:

1. S 42:38.
2. S 3:158.

> The Prophet of God appointed Zayd b. Ḥārithah as Commander for the battle of Mūtah and instructed that if Zayd were killed Ja'far would then be the Commander and if Ja'far too were killed the command was to go to 'Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥah.[1]

'Abd Allāh, the Companion (73 A.H.), was with them on the battlefield but Anas, the Companion (91 A.H.), was with the Prophet in Medina. Al-Bukhārī reports Anas as saying:

> The Prophet announced the death of Zayd, Ja'far and Ibn Rawāḥah to the people before news of them had reached them, saying Zayd took the standard and was smitten, then Ja'far took it and was smitten, then Ibn Rawāḥah took it and was smitten (tears meanwhile were dripping from the eyes of the prophet). Finally one of God's swords (meaning Khālid b. al-Walīd) took the standard till God granted them success.[2]

There was no injunction of the Prophet for the appointment of Khālid as Commander of the forces but in the absence of such an injunction the Muslims themselves settled the affair and the Prophet approved what happened on the battlefield.

iii. The prediction of the Prophet and his desire.

Al-Bukhārī reports that the Prophet already knew that Abū Bakr would be his successor. He transmits that a woman came to the Prophet in his last days to ask about something. He told her to come on another occasion. She, alluding to his imminent death, asked what she should do if she could not find him. The Prophet said:

> If you do not find me then go to Abū Bakr.[3]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.5, p.182.
2. ibid, v.5, p.182, 34.
3. ibid, v.5, p.5; v.9, pp.101, 135. The eminent Shī'ī traditionist and Commentator 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (307 A.H.) also reports that the Prophet had made this prediction to Ḥafṣah : 'Verily Abū Bakr will have the Khilāfah after me; then your father will have it after him.' She asked who had told him. He answered that God had told him (Al-Qummī, op.cit., v.2, p.376). The Qur'ān asserts that only those will have the Khilāfah with whom God is pleased. (See S 24:55). This explains that the position of Abū Bakr, as predicted in al-Qummī 's report, would be that of a rightly-guided Caliph.

The Prophet had already given indications that he was pleased with Abū Bakr. This can be seen with reference to the obligatory nature of the prayers for which the Prophet had to appoint someone in his absence. The Prophet during his illness commanded the Companions to ask Abū Bakr to lead the people in the prayer. Al-Bukhārī reports Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī, the Companion, as saying:

> The Prophet was ill and his illness became serious. He then said: Call Abū Bakr to lead the people in the prayer.[1]

'Ā'ishah, the Mother of the Faithful, was asked to describe the illness of the Prophet. Al-Bukhārī reports that this is what she described:

> The Prophet was seriously ill and he asked whether the people had prayed. When we told him that they had not, but were waiting for him, he said: 'Put some water for me in the tub'; and we did so. He bathed and as he was about to rise with difficulty he fainted. When he came round he asked if the people had prayed, and we told him that they had not but were waiting for him; and the people were staying in the mosque waiting for the Prophet for the 'ishā, the last evening prayer. So the Prophet sent instructions to Abū Bakr[2] to lead the people in the prayer. So the messenger came to him and told him that the Prophet required him to lead the people in the prayer. Abū Bakr, who was a sensitive man, told 'Umar to lead the people, but 'Umar replied that Abū Bakr was more entitled to that. So Abū Bakr led the prayers[3] during those days.
>
> Afterwards the Prophet experienced some improvement in his health and came out to the noon-prayer between two men, one of whom was Al-'Abbās, while Abū Bakr was leading the people. When Abū Bakr saw the Prophet he began to withdraw but the Prophet gave him a sign not to do so.[4]

'Ubayd Allāh, the transmitter from 'Ā'ishah, says that he, then, met 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās and told him what 'Ā'ishah had said. He did not make any objection but asked whether she had named the man who was with Al-'Abbās. He answered in the negative. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās said that it was 'Alī.[5]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, p.172.

2. Previously Abū Bakr had already led the people in the prayer when the Prophet had gone out of Medina to reconcile some of the tribes with each other and he was quite happy with the Imāmah of Abū Bakr. (See, ibid., v.1, p.174; v.9, p.92).

3. Ibn Kathīr, (774 A.H.) reports that during these days Abū Bakr led the people in seventeen or twenty prayers (Al-Bidāyah, v.5, p.235).

4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, p.176; v.9, p.120.

5. ibid, v.1, p.176.

This report shows that ʿAlī and Al-ʿAbbās were already there and that the Prophet had selected Abū Bakr to lead the people in the prayer, in their presence. This also indicates that the Prophet would have been pleased if Abū Bakr succeeded him although he had not appointed anyone as his state-successor. There is also the suggestion that the man next to Abū Bakr was ʿUmar and that if Abū Bakr was not in a position to do the needful he was proposing ʿUmar as his successor; and he was sure that the Prophet would have been happy to accept ʿUmar as being next to him (Abū Bakr).

However this outlook of the Prophet and his indication favouring Abū Bakr played a very important role in the appointment of Abū Bakr as Caliph and helped the Companions to elect him as the state-successor of the Prophet.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (463 A.H.) reports ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib as saying:

> Verily the Prophet remained sick for so many nights and days, when he was called for the prayer he said 'Ask Abū Bakr to lead the people in the prayer.' When the Prophet passed away I considered the matter that prayer was the pillar of Islām and the pivot of the religion; so we gave our consent for our state affairs in favour of the one to whom the Prophet was pleased (to entrust) our (purely) religious affair. So we made the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr ... and we have elaborated this issue in our work Al-Tamhīd.[1]

Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Sarakhsī (483 A.H.) in his commentary on the work of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (179 A.H.), the disciple of Abū Ḥanīfah, states:

> The Companions provided arrangements for the Khilāfah of Abū Bakr by saying that since the Prophet of God had selected him for their religious affair, why should they not be pleased with him for their state-affairs?[2]

ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion, reports that ʿUmar also referred to this argument when he was addressing the Anṣār who were suggesting that there should be two Amīrs, one from among them and one from among the immigrants.[3]

1. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Al-Istīʿāb, v.1, p.333.
2. Al-Sarakhsī, Sharḥ Siyar al-Kabīr, v.1, p.47.
3. Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, Sharḥ Shamāʾil al-Tirmidhī, v.2, p.219.

iv. The proposal and the appointment of Abū Bakr as Caliph.

Al-Bukhārī reports ʻUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, as stating:

> When God caused death to His Prophet the Anṣār (helpers) made opposition to us and assembled all of them in the Saqīfah (the large roofed building for meetings) of the Banū Sāʻidah; and ʻAlī and al-Zubayr kept aloof from us; and the immigrants came to Abū Bakr and gathered there. I said to Abū Bakr: 'Let us go to our brethren, the helpers.' We went to see them and when we were on the point of reaching there we met two of their virtuous men and they told us what was the people's inclination. They asked us, the immigrants, where we were going. We answered: 'We are going to these brethren of ours, the helpers.' They advised us not to go near them and asked us to decide our affair ourselves. I said: 'We shall certainly go to them.' So we went until we reached the Saqīfah of the Banū Sāʻidah.
>
> We saw there a man, in the middle, all wrapped up, and I asked who he was. They said that he was Saʻd b. ʻUbādah. I asked what was the matter with him? They answered that he was suffering from fever.
>
> After a while a speaker from among them bore witness to God and praised God as He deserves and then he said: We are the Anṣār of God and we are the army of Islām; and you the group of immigrants are a party and some of you came here only to uproot us and to achieve rule over us:
>
> When he stopped I intended to speak and I had prepared a speech which I did not want to utter anything in the presence of Abū Bakr without withdrawing some of it. When I intended to speak, Abū Bakr asked me to keep silent and I did not like to cause him anger. Abū Bakr, then, delivered a speech and he was more tolerant than I and observed more dignity than I. By God, he did not leave unsaid any word which I had nicely prepared but he exposed that spontaneously or else he delivered better than that; and he said (to the Anṣār): 'What you have mentioned of your goodness you deserve ; and as regards this affair (of state) it will not be recognised except by this tribe of Quraysh as they are by race and place the best of the Arabs and I am pleased with their two men (here); so take the oath of allegiance to any of them you like.' He then took my hand and the hand of Abū ʻUbaydah b. al-Jarrāḥ, and he was sitting between us.

> I was not displeased with anything except with this (last) thing. By God, if I had been brought forth and put to death without any sin it would have been better for me than that I would have been appointed over people in which there had been Abū Bakr. O God! At the time of death, may my soul make easy for me the thing which I do not find easy now.
> One man from among the Anṣār (Ḥubāb b. al-Mundhir) said: 'We are the tested pillar of Islām and the sacred foundation of it. O people of Quraysh! there should be two Amīrs one from among us and one from among you.' There was then confused noise and the voices were raised so that I was afraid of the dispute.
> So I said: 'Abū Bakr! Extend your hand.' He extended his hand and I took the oath of allegiance to him; then the immigrants took the oath of allegiance to him, and then the Anṣār, the helpers did so.[1]

Al-Bukhārī reports Anas B. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), as stating that on the next day there was held a general meeting in the Mosque in which ʿUmar made a speech and then the generality of the people took the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr. There were some people who had already taken the oath of allegiance in the Saqīfah. Abū Bakr accepted this general oath of allegiance when he was in the pulpit.[2]

v. The allegiance of ʿAlī to Abū Bakr.

To this election of Abū Bakr as Caliph no one made any objection; neither ʿAlī nor ʿAbbās raised any question. It was required of a man of ʿAlī's status particularly to take the oath of allegiance but he did not do so and felt ill, which was why he was not called to the meeting of the Saqīfah. He agreed with the generality of the Muslims, offered the prayers under the Imāmah (leadership) of Abū Bakr, but did not take the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr for six months.

After the death of Fāṭimah, the daughter of the Prophet, ʿAlī sensed an unfamiliar atmosphere. Al-Bukhārī reports ʿĀʾishah, the Mother of the Faithful, as stating:

> When Fāṭimah died ʿAlī sensed the unfamiliar faces of the people and he sought reconciliation with Abū Bakr and desired to take the specific

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.211.

> oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr and for over many months he had still not taken that oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr. He sent his message to Abū Bakr calling him alone to him .... When Abū Bakr went to him he (ʿAlī) bore witness to God and said: 'Verily we recognise your excellence and what benefit God has bestowed upon you; and we do not feel jealous for the good which God has given to you but we felt that you overlooked us in the affair and we held the opinion that we should have our position because of our relationship to the Prophet'. The eyes of Abū Bakr shed tears. Abū Bakr spoke and he said: 'By the one in whose hand my life is the relation of the Prophet is more loving to me than my own relation ....' ʿAlī said: 'I shall come to you this afternoon to take the oath of allegiance.' After the noon-prayer Abū Bakr came up to the pulpit, bore witness to God and mentioned the eminence of ʿAlī and the reason for his keeping away and his excuse which he had told him; and then he sought forgiveness from God. Then ʿAlī bore witness to God and admitted the greatness of Abū Bakr and said that he had not acted out of jealousy for Abū Bakr in what he had been doing (up to then) nor in order to deny the excellence which God had conferred upon him (Abū Bakr) but merely from the feeling that they (the Family of the Prophet) had their share in the affair and that he (Abū Bakr) had overlooked them; that is why they felt aggrieved. All the Muslims felt happy (with this reconciliation) and said that ʿAlī had acted rightly and they became close to ʿAlī when the matter was reconciled.[1]

Ibn Kathīr (774 A.H.) corroborates this statement as follows: He reports ʿAlī and al-Zubayr as saying:

> We were not aggrieved except for the reason that we had been kept out of the consultation. Verily we admit Abū Bakr as being the most deserving for this affair and he is the Companion of the Cave; and we recognise his excellence and his goodness; and indeed the Prophet of God had commanded him to lead the people in the prayer, in his life time....[2]

1. ibid, v.5, p.178.
2. Ibn Kathīr, op.cit., v.5, p.250, 286.

Ibn Kathīr remarks that the report bears a good chain. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (852 A.H.) says that it was the second occasion of ʿAlī's taking the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr, for ʿAlī had already accepted him as Caliph. Al-ʿAsqālānī says:

> Ibn Ḥibbān had established the tradition of Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī and the others that ʿAlī had already taken an oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr, in the beginning.[1]

Ibn Saʿd and Ibn Jarīr also transmit this report of Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī.[2]

vi. The Shīʿī evidence of ʿAlī's co-operation with the three Caliphs.

Apart from the doctrinal approach of al-Kulaynī on the points as to how, according to Shīʿī Faith, Imāmah is established and how the Imām is appointed, it may be appropriate to give here the practical Shīʿī evidence as to how ʿAlī co-operated with the three Caliphs before him.

It is clear that the Shīʿīs stand in sharp opposition to the first three Caliphs and they do not allow any plausible consideration of the disputes of the Companions which may bring these differences to an end. The Shīʿīs compiled their own collections of Ḥadīth in which they established the three Caliphs and ʿAlī as on two variant lines. Yet we find some glimpses therein which indicate that ʿAlī apparently co-operated with them and had not made any opposition to them. The Shīʿīs interpret all such affairs as being based on taqīyah (pious dissimulation).

(a) Co-operation with Abū Bakr.

In the matter of taking the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr al-Kulaynī and al-Kashshī report al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> All the people apostatized after the Prophet except three, (the Imām was asked to mention them and he mentioned) al-Miqdād b. al-Aswad, Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, and Salmān al-Fārisī.

1. Al-ʿAsqalānī, Fatḥ al-Bārī, v.7, p.379.
2. ʿAlī al-Muttaqī, Kanz al-ʿUmmāl, v.3, p.131.

> The people came to know of this after a while. These three underwent many hardships, but they did not take the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr till they brought ʿAlī forcibly so that he took the oath of allegiance.[1]

Al-Ṭabarsī (early sixth century A.H.) reports that ʿAlī before his taking the oath recited the verse: 'Son of my mother! Surely the people reckoned me weak and had well-nigh slain me:'[2] Al-Ṭabarsī then reports:

> Then ʿAlī held the hand of Abū Bakr and took the oath of allegiance to him.[3]

In the matter of ʿAlī's praying under the leadership of Abū Bakr, al-Ṭabarsī (early sixth century A.H.) reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as transmitting that when the (general) oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr had been taken and his rule was established over all the Immigrants and the Helpers, they (Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) planned to kill ʿAlī; and they fixed the time when he would be offering the prayer in the mosque; and the duty of killing ʿAlī was assigned to Khālid b. al-Walīd. Al-Ṭabarsī reports in this context as follows:

> Then ʿAlī got up, prepared for the prayer, came into the Mosque and offered his prayer behind Abū Bakr.[4]

Whether the story which has been linked with Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq is rightly traced back to the Imām or not is not the point at issue; but we see here that ʿAlī has been depicted as being closely linked with Abū Bakr. The Sunnī traditionist and historian Ibn Kathīr (774 A.H.) also transmits that ʿAlī offered the prayer under the Imāmah of Abu Bakr[5] but he does not relate any such story of conspiracy.

(b) Co-operation with ʿUmar.

In regard to ʿUmar, the Second Caliph, the authorities indicate that ʿAlī's relationship to him is a consultative one, as of two close companions.

Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (404 A.H.) reports that ʿUmar intended to go into battle with the Byzantines and he consulted ʿAlī

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.246, Al-Kashshī, Rijāl, p.12.
2. S 7:150.
3. Al-Ṭabarsī, Iḥtijāj, v.1, p.110.
4. ibid, v.1, p.126.
5. See, Ibn Kathīr, op.cit., v.5, pp.249,286.

on that point. ʻAlī gave his opinion as follows:

> Verily God has entrusted to the people of this Religion both the honour of the State and keeping of discrepancies in secret. He is the One Who helped them when they were few in number and had no support, and Who guarded them when they were few in number and not in a position to defend themselves. He is Alive and will never die.
>
> If you go yourself to this enemy and fight them and are defeated, there will be no escape for the Muslims living in the far lands. They will have no refuge after you to whom they may go. So send an experienced hand to them.[1]

When ʻUmar intended to go to battle with the Sāsānīs, he consulted ʻAlī and the latter gave the following advice:

> Verily the success or failure of this affair has never been on the basis of great or small numbers. It is the Religion of God which He has made victorious and it is His force which He has succoured and extended, so that it has reached where it has reached and has arisen where it has arisen; and we have the promise from God and God fulfils His promise and He helps His forces.... The Arabs although few in number today are great with the power of Islam and are mighty with their unity. So be first around which the handmill of the Arabs may rotate...; for we have never been fighting in the past on the basis of abundance in numbers but we have been fighting on the basis of God's help and His assistance.[2]

Al-Kulaynī reports that ʻUmar once sent a young boy to prison saying that the evidence would be called later on. ʻAlī met that boy on the way and the boy made a protest. ʻAlī asked the men in whose custody the boy was to take him back to ʻUmar. ʻUmar asked them why they had brought him back. They answered:

> ʻAlī b. Abī Ṭālib commanded us to bring him back to you and we have heard you saying: Do not disobey ʻAlī in anything.[3]

1. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.2, pp.24-5.
2. ibid, v.2, pp.39-40.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.7, p.424.

Meanwhile ʿAlī arrived and asked ʿUmar to allow him to take a decision. ʿUmar said: 'Why not?' This explains how closely related to each other they were.

(c) Co-operation with ʿUthmān.

ʿAlī's relationship to ʿUthmān is evidenced by al-Kulaynī who reports that ʿUthmān felt ill at Minā and commanded the man who had called him for prayer, to go to ʿAlī and ask him to lead the people in the prayer. He went to ʿAlī and said:

> ʿUthmān, the Commander of the Faithful, asks you to lead the people in the ʿAṣr prayer.[1]

This suggests that ʿAlī had not dissociated himself from ʿUthmān, the Commander of the Faithful, and that he was not on unpleasant terms with the other companions. This is consistent with the report of al-Bukhārī that ʿAlī had taken the oath of allegiance to ʿUthmān.[2]

ʿAlī's allegiance to the first three Caliphs can further be deduced from his view of his own Imāmah which he deemed as having been established on the basis of the Imāmah of the first three Caliphs. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (404 A.H.) reports ʿAlī as writing in one of his letters to Muʿāwīyah, the Companion, as follows:

> Verily the people, who had taken the oath of allegiance to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān, have taken the oath of allegiance to me and they took the oath of allegiance (to me) on the same conditions on which they had taken the oath of allegiance to them. So there was no other choice for those who were present there (in the meeting when the Companions had taken the oath of allegiance to ʿAlī) nor was it rightful for those who were absent to reject (the decision of those who were present). It is for the Immigrants and the Helpers to take counsel; so if they agree upon a man and name him Imām he is approved by God.[3]

This quotation also indicates that the agreement of those who are present is binding and authoritative for those who are absent. This point is further brought out in the following statement by ʿAlī:

1. ibid, v.4, p.518.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.5, p.22.
3. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.3, p.8.

> By my life, if the Imāmah is not established without being conducted by the generality of the people, then there is no method of adopting it (in these days); instead, the people of counsel take decisions for those who keep absent; then it is not for those who are present there to go back (on their decisions) and there is no other choice for those who are absent.[1]

This is ample evidence that the established Imāmah of ʿAlī had for its basis the Sunnī principles for the appointment of an Imām and that he (ʿAlī) had fully co-operated with his predecessors. Now we return to the Sunnī principles for the appointment of an Imām and his removal if it is required.

vii. The Principles of the appointment of an Imām and his dismissal.

(a) The different methods of the appointment.

We have already quoted al-Bukhārī[2] as transmitting from ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, that if he were to appoint his successor it would be lawful since Abū Bakr had appointed his successor and if he were not to appoint his successor and were to leave it to the people to decide the matter that too would be lawful as the Prophet had not appointed anyone as his State successor. ʿUmar brought forth the third exemplary practice in that he left the matter to the council of six prominent Companions; and they were in a position to appoint an Imām. Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) states:

> It is unanimously agreed that the Khilāfah is established with the appointment by the foregoing Imām, and, if there is no such appointment, then by the counsel of the men of opinion; and they agree that it is also lawful for the Imām to leave the affair to a council as ʿUmar did with the six Companions.[3]

Ibn Hammām al-Iskandarī (861 A.H.) states in Al-Musāirah

1. ibid, v.2, p.105.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.100. (See, P. 190).
3. Al-Nawawī, op.cit., v.2, p.120.

> The Imāmah stands established if the Caliph appoints his successor, as Abū Bakr did, or it is established if a group of the religious leaders or a section of the men of opinion and resolution take the oath of allegiance to him. Al-Ashʿarī says that it is sufficient if one of the prominent religious leaders from the men of opinion takes the oath of allegiance, provided that it is conducted in the presence of witnesses who can refute the rejection, if that is made; and the Muʿtazilīs have laid down conditions that five religious leaders should agree with it and some Ḥanafīs say that there should be a body of such men but that there is no particular number.[1]

ʿAlī al-Qārī (1014 A.H.) corroborates this statement as follows:

> The Imāmah according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa' al-Jamāʿah is established either by election of the religious leaders of decision and resolution and of the men of justice and opinion as the Imāmah of Abū Bakr was established; or else (it is established) by nomination of the foregoing Imām and his designation as the Imāmah of ʿUmar was established by the nomination of Abū Bakr.[2]

Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī (1253 A.H.) adds that the Imām is rightly established when his command is enforced.[3] So if he is duly elected but cannot acquire a position such that his command is enforced because of the opposition made to him then his Imāmah is not accepted as established.

(b) The different categories of the Imāms.

We have already given[4] the report of ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, stating the two categories of Imāms and suggesting another category whereby the Imām may be appointed by a council. Al-Bukhārī gives another category of Imām; one whose appointment is not desired; but if he is set over the Muslims and he has taken possession of the Imāmah, his command will stand enforced provided that it fulfils the conditions of an Imām. Al-Bukhārī reports Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

1. Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, op.cit., v.1, p.513; v.3, p.428.
2. Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, op.cit., p.179.
3. Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, op.cit., v.4, p.423.
4. See, P.190. and P.203.

> Listen and obey, even if an Abyssinian slave with a head small like a raisin is made ruler over you.[1]

Muslim reports Umm Salamah, the Mother of the Faithful, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> There will be rulers over you; some of their actions you will approve and some of them you will disapprove of. He who expresses disapproval is guiltless, and he who feels disapproval is safe, but one who is pleased (with them) and follows (them) perishes. They asked: 'Shall we not fight against them?' He replied: 'No, as long as they pray! No, indeed, as long as they pray!'[2]

The Hanafī jurist, the author of Al-Durr al-Mukhtār, corroborates that the government of a man who himself takes possession of the Imāmah stands established by reason of the necessity of the enforcement of the Law.[3]

Arising from these statements one may conclude that there are four categories of Imāms:

1. The Imāms appointed by the general public like Abū Bakr and ʿAlī.
2. The Imāms appointed by the foregoing Imāms as was the case of ʿUmar.
3. The Imāms appointed by a council as was the case of ʿUthmān.
4. The Imāms who take possession by force.

(c) The conditions for the dismissal of an Imām.

The traditions which we have discussed here also suggest that the Imām is not to be deposed from the Imāmah on account of immorality, although his orders which are inconsistent with the instructions of the Book and the Prophet are not liable to obedience. Al-Nasafī (537A.H.) states:

> The Imām is not to be deposed from the Imāmah on account of immorality or tyranny.[4]

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) states:

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.78.
2. Muslim, op.cit., v.6, p.23.
3. See, Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, op.cit., v.1, p.512.
4. Al-Nasafī, op.cit., p.185.

> Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ says that all scholars agree that the *Imāmah* of an unbeliever is not established and if the Imām is converted to become an unbeliever he is to be deposed. In the same way if he gives up establishing the prayer and the call to prayer he is to be deposed.... If he commits unbelief and alters the Law or if he innovates he is to be put out of his office and his commands need not be obeyed; and it is obligatory for the Muslims to take a stand and depose him and appoint a rightful Imām if it is possible for them.... The majority of the Sunnī jurists, traditionists and the scholars of dogmatics say that he is not to be dismissed on account of immorality and tyranny nor for suspending of the claims. He should not be deposed and it is not lawful to rebel against him, but it is necessary to advise him and to inspire fear in him for the terror of the Last Day.[1]

Qāḍī ʿAḍḍ al-Dīn, the author of *Al-Mawāqif*, writes:

> It is rightful for the community to depose the Imām and dismiss him for the reasons which make it necessary; i.e. if he is the cause of disturbing the affairs of the Muslims and if he has let fall the matters of Religion; for it was in their power to appoint him and establish him to manage their affairs and to elevate them.[2]

Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī elaborates this as follows:

> The establishment of *Imāmah* is broken for these reasons which nullify the object of *Imāmah* such as apostasy, overpowering insanity, captivity such that his release cannot be expected; and (it is nullified) for the weaknesses which make him forget the things which are evident, for blindness, deafness, and dumbness; and in the same way he is deposed if he deposes himself for his helplessness to establish the benefit of the Muslims even though the reason may not be evident, but so long as he feels that in himself.[3]

All these provisions for the Imām's dismissal show that obedience to the Imāms is not unconditional and that the Sunnīs never believe the Imāms to be above defects and sins.

1. Al-Nawawī, *op.cit.*, v.2, p.125.
2. See, Ibn ʿAbidīn al-Shāmī, *op.cit.*, v.3, p.429.
3. *ibid*, v.3, p.429.

6. The establishment of the Imāmah among the Shīʿīs.

We have already discussed how ʿAlī, the First Divine Imām among the Shīʿīs, apparently co-operated with his predecessors. The Shīʿīs interpret all these events as having been based on pious dissimulation. As regards their doctrine they take variant stands which are quite different from the Sunnīs' position.

i. Al-Kulaynī's conception of Imāmah:

The Shīʿīs believe that Imāmah is a Divine Status and the believers have no chance of their own selection. The Imām is divinely appointed and Imāmah is not acquired by human efforts or by making a certain qualification to acquire that. Al-Kulaynī reports al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, as saying:

> Do the people know the rank of Imāmah and its status among the community so as to allow them to elect their Imām? Verily the Imāmah is too elevated in rank, too great in eminence, too superior in position, and too highly preserved in its aspects and in its remote depth as to allow them to reach it by their reason or to acquire it by their opinions or that they should appoint an Imām of their own choice. Verily God, the Mighty and the Exalted graced Ibrāhīm with Imāmah after the nubūwah (prophethood) and the wilāyah (friendship) so as to make it the third office; and it is the eminence which He bestowed upon him, whereby He made his mention well-known when He said: 'Verily I am making you an Imām!'[1]

Al-Majlisī (1110 A.H.) says:

> It is proved from trustworthy traditions that the status of the Imāmah is above the status of Prophethood.[2]
>
> It is true that in eminence, conditions and attributes there is no difference between the Prophet and the Imām.[3] It is obvious that the status of the Imāmah is like the status of the Prophethood.[4]

Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ (1091 A.H.) states:

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.199.
2. Al-Bāqir al-Majlisī, Ḥayāt al-Qulūb, v.3, p.2.
3. ibid, v.3, p.3.
4. ibid, v.3, p.25.

> All the attributes which stand as conditions for the Prophet are the conditions for the Imām except Prophethood. Imām Ṣādiq says: 'Everything which is rightful for the Prophet we deserve that, except Prophethood and marriage'.[1]

ii. The Divine Imāmah of ʿAlī and his successors.

The Qurʾān does not mention by name any particular Companion of the Prophet except Zayd. The context in which Zayd has been named has no connection with the succession to the Prophet. Al-Kulaynī interprets some general verses of the Qurʾān to establish the Imāmah of ʿAlī. Abū Baṣīr asked Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, to interpret the following verse of the Qurʾān:

> O you who believe! obey God and obey the Apostle and those in authority among you.[2]

The Imām said:

> It was revealed relating to ʿAlī b. Abū Ṭālib, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn.

Abū Baṣīr said that the people asked why God had not named in the Qurʾān ʿAlī and the children of his family? The Imām answered as follows:

> Tell them that (the command for) prayer came down in revelation but God did not specify whether (it was to be offered) with three or four rakʿāt, and so the Prophet of God interpreted that for them; (the command for) zakāh came down in revelation and God did not tell them that one dirham (was to be given) out of every forty dirhams, and so the Prophet of God interpreted that for them; and the command for hajj was revealed and God did not say: 'Make seven rounds', and so the Prophet of God interpreted that for them. And it was revealed: 'Obey God and obey the Apostle and those in authority among you.' And this was revealed relating to ʿAlī, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, so that the Prophet said:
>
> He who has me as his mawlā (patron) has ʿAlī as his mawlā.[3]

1. Mullā Muḥsin, Minhāj al-Nijāt, p.280.
2. S 4:59.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.287. The word mawlā bears many meanings such as Master, Lord, Freed slave, Helper, auxiliary, friend, companion and follower. According to the Shīʿis it means here patron.

This report bears witness to the fact that there is no clear-cut injunction for the uninterrupted Imāmah of ʿAlī going back to the time of the Prophet. The verses of the Qurʾān which are quoted in this context are general and the burden of proof lies on the traditions.

In relation to the above-quoted tradition three points are noteworthy; firstly whether the tradition is rightly traced back to the Prophet; and secondly whether its evidence for the Divine succession to the Prophet is clear and certain; and thirdly, whether this was expressed before the perfection of the Religion which was announced on the ninth of Dhū al-Ḥajjah or whether it was declared after the Religion had already been completed.

According to the Shīʿī traditionists[1] this tradition is rightly traced back to the Prophet. Al-Majlisī comments:

> It is Ṣaḥīḥ in both its chains.[2]

As regards its purported meaning, this is not clear. There are some other traditions which indicate that up to the last days of the Prophet it was not certain who was going to succeed the Prophet. Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as quoting the last words of the Prophet which he spoke from his pulpit as follows:

> I ask the one who will be my successor to my people to remember God and observe mercy on the Muslims and have regard for their old people.[3]

Al-Majlisī (1110 A.H.) says that the chain of transmitters of this tradition is trustworthy. This report leaves evidence that up to that time there was no appointment for the successor of the Prophet. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq further reports:

> During the last days of the Prophet he sent for al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib and ʿAlī. He first said to al-ʿAbbās: 'O uncle of Muḥammad!

1. The Sunnī traditionists declare this to be a ḍaʿīf tradition. Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūsuf al-Zaylaʿī (762 A.H.) states that this is so in spite of its numerous chains. (See, Naṣb al-Rāyah, v.1, p.360.
2. Al-Majlisī, Mirʾat al-ʿUqūl, v.1, p.204.
3. Al-Majlisī, Jilāʾ al-ʿUyūn, p.58.

> Will you take over the estate of Muḥammad, pay back what is due from him and fulfil his promises?' Al-ʿAbbās refused him and said: 'May my parents be a sacrifice for you; I am an old man having so many dependants and am not financially sound. No one can represent you and you exceed the blowing wind (you are more generous).' The Prophet kept silent for a while and repeated the same words and al-ʿAbbās answered as previously. Then the Prophet said: 'Then I shall give it to one who will accept it as it should be', and then he addressed ʿAlī; 'O brother of Muḥammad! Will you fulfil the promises of Muḥammad, pay back what is due from him and take his estate?' ʿAlī answered in the affirmative and said: 'May my parents be a sacrifice for you, it is on me and for me'. ʿAlī says that he was facing the Prophet and that the Prophet took his ring from his finger and told him (ʿAlī) to put it on his finger during his (the Prophet's) life.[1]

Al-Majlisī comments that al-Kulaynī, Ibn Bābawayh, Shaykh Ṭūsī, Shaykh Mufīd and most of the traditionists among the Shīʿīs and the generality of Muslims have all reported with trustworthy chains from Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, Muḥammad Bāqir, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and the others that when it was the time of the Prophet's death the sickness was grave and the Prophet called for ʿAlī and ʿAbbās; and the house was filled with the Companions, the Immigrants and the Helpers; and the Prophet first asked his uncle ʿAbbās to accept his testament.... Then he said to ʿAlī: 'O ʿAlī! Be my Khalīfah (Successor) over my people and convey my message of apostleship to the people after me'.[2]

This report also suggests that the Prophet's declaration at the pond of Khumm was not a clear-cut injunction for the Prophet's political succession. Al-Ṭabarsī agrees with this conclusion and says:

> The Prophet announced God's authority by a hint but not by a clear-cut expression.[3]

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.236.
2. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.59.
3. Al-Ṭabarsī, op.cit., v.1, p.380.

Al-Ḥillī (762 A.H.) also asserts that there is a dispute in regard to its evidence for (the purported meaning of) Imāmah.[1] The apparent meaning of this tradition simply shows how ʿAlī was respected by the Prophet and how he was pleased with him (with ʿAlī).

Furāt b. Ibrāhīm (the Shīʿī traditionist of the third century A.H.) reports that al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, was asked to explain the following verse of the Qurʾān:

> You have no concern in the affair.[2]

The Imām interpreted it as follows:

> The Prophet desired that the affair after him should go to ʿAlī but God refused.[3]

Such reports indicate that there was no clear-cut injunction of the Prophet for his successor as head of state, and it was not for him to appoint his successor. But the Shīʿī traditionists report that the Prophet on his death-bed made the appointment and announced ʿAlī as his successor as head of state. The basis on which the Prophet made this declaration is stated to be a Divine testament. Al-Kulaynī provides ample evidence that the Prophet on his death-bed gave this testament to ʿAlī. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, reports:

> Verily the testament was revealed in a written form to Muḥammad. No sealed book had ever been revealed to Muḥammad except this testament. Jibrīl said: 'O Muḥammad it is your testament to your family for your people:' The Prophet asked 'For whom of my family?' Jibrīl answered: 'For the one whom God made the best of your family and for his children, so that he may inherit the knowledge of Prophethood as Ibrāhīm gave that knowledge in his inheritance. It is for ʿAlī and for your children after ʿAlī.' And there were (twelve) seals on that. Alī opened the first seal and acted in accordance with that; al-Ḥasan then opened the second seal and acted as he was commanded in that. When al-Ḥasan expired and passed away al-Ḥusayn opened the third seal and found therein: 'Fight, kill and be killed and advance with certain men even to their death, for the sake of God; they will not die except with you!' Al-Ḥusayn acted upon this. When he passed

1. Al-Ḥillī, Kashf al-Murād, p.230.
2. S 3:127.
3. Furāt b. Ibrāhīm, op.cit., p.19.

> away he handed it over to ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn; he opened the fourth seal and found therein that one should keep silent and remain aloof because the truth was veiled. When he died and passed away he handed it over to Muḥammad b. ʿAlī (al-Bāqir) and he opened the fifth seal and he found therein: 'Explain the Book of God, attest your fathers, give your testament to your son and form a community and stand with what is due to God, the Mighty and the Excellent, and say what is true, whether it is fear or peace and do not be afraid of any but God.' He acted upon that and then handed over that to his successor.

Muʿādh b. Kathīr, the transmitter from the Imām, asked him if he was the one who succeeded al-Bāqir. The Imām answered:

> O Muʿādh! There is nothing to hinder me from telling you that I am the successor except the fact that you will make it public.

Muʿādh then asked: I pray to God Who bestowed upon you this favour from your father to bestow the same upon your children before (your) death. The Imām said:

> God has done so, O Muʿādh

Muʿādh then asked who was the one. The Imām answered; and he made an indication with his hand to Mūsā b. Kāẓim:

> This one who is sleeping.[1]

This report is a clear-cut injunction that the continuing Imāmah is a Divine guidance of the community, that it is not left to the people to appoint their Imām, and that these Imāms are from the Family of the Prophet. But there is an indication in this report that up to that time it was not well-published and it was limited to a few men who were the most trustworthy among them. It also bears witness to the fact that al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām,[2] was the first to form a community of the people truly linked with the Family of the Prophet.

There is further indication that this Divine Imāmah had to some extent shifted after the incident of Karbalāʾ

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, pp.279-80.
2. Al-Bāqir was specially asked 'to form a community'. This may indicates that there was no formation of any conspicuous Shīʿī sect before him.

from the political phase and it was now merely a spiritual seat of learning and guidance. It had left behind it the affair of politics and had come to provide a purely spiritual contribution but their claim to take the rein of political affairs into their hands before the Last Day, at the time of the Twelfth Imām al-Mahdī, was still reserved.

We shall discuss the spiritual qualities of the Imāms later. Here we discuss the Divine status of the Imāmah among the Shī'īs and that to what degree the Divine Imāms were publicly recognised as such.

Al-Kulaynī lays down many Chapter-headings so as to establish the Divine status of the Imāms, and he transmits numerous traditions to support his approach. We quote here some of these headings as follows:

1. The Imāms are the representatives of God's command and the treasurers of His knowledge.[1]
2. The Imāms are the Khulafā' of God on His earth and they are His doors by which He can be approached.[2]
3. Verily the Imāms are the mine of Knowledge, the tree of Prophethood and the ones to whom the angels come.[3]
4. Verily God speaks to the Imāms and they are endowed with the (purported) meanings.[4]
5. It is obligatory to obey the Imāms.[5]

Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, expresses his belief as follows:

> I bear witness that 'Alī is Imām, and God has established obedience to him as obligatory; verily al-Ḥasan is Imām, and God established obedience to him as obligatory; verily al-Husayn is Imām, and God established obedience to him as obligatory; verily 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn is Imām, and God established obedience to him as obligatory; verily Muḥammad b. 'Alī (al-Bāqir) is Imām, and God made obedience to him obligatory.[6]

1. ibid, v.1, p.192.
2. ibid, p.193.
3. ibid, p.221.
4. ibid, p.270.
5. ibid, p.185.
6. ibid, v.1, p.186.

According to this instruction of the Imām it is not allowed to fall into dispute with any of the twelve Imāms and obedience to them is unconditional by reason of their Divine status. The Sunnīs believe that unconditional obedience is only for God and the Prophet, while obedience to the Imāms is subject to their being consistent with the Book and the Prophet. The Qur'ān gives a general instruction in this context as follows:

> O you who believe! obey God and obey the Apostle and those in authority from among you; then if you fall into dispute about anything, refer it to God and the Apostle if you believe in God and the Last Day.[1]

The Qur'ān does not command one to refer a disputed affair to those in authority but it is referred only to God and the Prophet. This suggests that a dispute between men in authority and the public could also occur and these disputes too should be referred to the Book and the Prophet. The disputes between various members of the public could easily be referred to the Book, the Prophet and the men in authority. If there had been no provision for falling into dispute with the men in authority the Qur'ān would not have restricted the final judgement to the Book and the Sunnah of the Prophet:

Al-Kulaynī objects to this explanation and reports that al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, was asked to comment upon the following verse of the Qur'ān:

> Verily God commands you to make over trusts to those worthy of them and when you take decisions among people you should judge with justice.

The Imām answered as follows:

> We are meant here (in this verse), (to understand) that the foregoing Imām hands over the charge of the Books, the Standard, and the weapons to the next after him.

The Imām then referred to the second part of this verse and explained it as follows:

1. S 4:59.

> When you take a decision among the people 'you should judge with justice' alludes to a case referred to you (to the addressees of the first part of the verse, the Imāms themselves); then God says: 'Obey God and the Apostle and the men in authority from among you'. We are particularly meant here. God commanded all the believers to obey us up to the Last Day. So if you are afraid of any dispute in any affair then refer it to God, and the Apostle and the men in authority from among you; and it was revealed in this sequence. How is it possible that God may command people to obey the men in authority and then allow them to fall into dispute with them? It is said to those persons who are the addressees of (the first part of the verse): 'Obey God and the Apostles and the men in authority.'[1]

We see that before the establishment of the unconditional obedience to the Imāms and before the certain acceptance of their Divine status the Companions of ʿAlī fell into dispute with him after the battle of Ṣiffīn; and ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, referred to this verse of the Qurʾān. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (404 A.H.) reports ʿAlī as saying:

> And when the people called us to accept the Qurʾān as arbitrator, we were not ready to go back from the Book of God; and God says: 'If you fall into dispute about anything, refer it to God and the Apostle.' The reference to God means that we should take a decision in accordance with His Book, and the reference to the Prophet means that we take hold of his Sunnah. When it is rightly decided according to the Book of God and the Sunnah of the Prophet, we are the most deserving for that.[2]

It shows that up to that time the Divine status of the Imāms had not been established and obedience to the Imāms was not accepted as unconditional.

In the second century A.H., in the time of al-Bāqir and Jaʿfar, the doctrine of the Divine status of the Imāms had become established, but it was limited to the most trustworthy Companions of the Imāms; and the majority of the people coming into contact with these Imāms did not believe in their Divine status. Al-Majlisī, the Second, states:

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.276.
2. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.2, p.8.

> It is evident from the traditions that there were many Shīʿī transmitters in the times of the Imāms who did not believe that the Imāms were divinely protected from sins; instead they believed that the Imāms were virtuous men of learning and this is obvious from al-Kashshī's Rijāl. In spite of this the Imāms accepted them as being believers and held that they were also the just ones.[1]

When the doctrine of the Divine status of the Imāms had been fully developed and the traditions from the Imāms which clearly explained that they were directly linked with God had attained celebrity then it became established that it was obligatory to accept their divine status and it was accepted as one of the Essentials of the Shīʿī Faith. Al-Majlisī gives as follows one explanation for the defence of the Imāms' Companions who did not believe in their Divine status:

> It is possible that in those times this doctrine would not have attained the status of being regarded as an Essential of the Shīʿī Faith.[2]

This statement bears evidence that the doctrine of the Divine Imāmah of the Imāms had developed gradually. It had an early origin but the matter of its attaining celebrity comes later on.

The pious dissimulation (taqīyah) of the Imāms interrupted the celebrity of their Divine status. It affected the community in such a way that those who did not recognise this Divine Imāmah, provided that, in the case of those who believed in the Oneness of God and admitted the Prophethood of Muḥammad and did not observe any enmity or malice for the Family of the Prophet, they would certainly not be the people of hell, but there would be hope for their having salvation on the Day of resurrection. Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, was asked to explain the position of such people after death. The Imām answered:

> They are entrusted to God's command (as He likes).[3]

1. Al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.328.
2. ibid, p.329.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.247.

Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, says that the status of being a Muslim is more general than the status of being a Mu'min (which is acquired among the Shī'īs by having faith in the Divine Imāmah). The Imām says:

> Verily Islām is before Īmān; and the matters of inheritance and marriage are based on one's being a Muslim but the reward in the Hereafter will be on the basis of Īmān.[1]

The Imām further states:

> We are the men whom God made it obligatory that others should obey. It is not for the people to do anything but to recognise us, and they are not excused for their having been in ignorance about us. One who has recognised us is Mu'min and one who has rejected us is kafir (unbeliever); and one who did not recognise us and did not reject us has been misled until he has turned to the right (path) and to obedience to us, which God has made obligatory for him. If he passes away in his position of being misled he is in the hand of God and He will treat him as He likes.[2]

This is the only allowance which can be given to those who do not believe in the Divine status of the Imāmah. As regards the Shī'ī circles of Faith, this issue has already attained the status of being an Essential of the Shī'ī Faith. Al-Māmaqānī says in discussion of the doctrine of an early transmitter:

> Verily it is one of the Essentials (of the Shī'ī Faith) that one who believes in any Imām other than these Twelve has deviated.[3]

1. ibid, v.1, p.173.
2. ibid, v.1, p.187.
3. Al-Māmaqānī, Tanqīh al-Maqāl, v.3, p.223.

iii. The Spiritual status of the Imāms.

We have already discussed under the heading The function of the Imāms the spiritual aspect of the Imāmah and how the Imāms keep the knowledge of Religion purified and how they properly interpret the Qur'ān and correctly represent the Prophet. Here we lay stress on their Divine status and state that if the people did not give the rein of the State into their hands their spiritual status would not be nullified by that. Al-Kulaynī lays down various Chapter-headings which show how the Imāms are held in high esteem and what status they do have in their own persons. We quote here some of these Chapter-headings under which numerous traditions have been given:

> The Imāms are witness of God over all His creatures;[1] the Imāms are the Light of God;[2] the Imāms are the pillars of the earth;[3] the men of Dhikr (remembrance) from whom God commanded the creatures to ask the questions are the Imāms;[4] verily the men whom God mentioned as being the bearers of knowledge are the Imāms;[5] those who have deep knowledge are the Imāms;[6] the men whom God selected from among His servants and made them inherit His Book are the Imāms;[7] the actions of the people are presented to the Prophet and the Imāms;[8] the Imāms inherit the knowledge of the Prophet and the knowledge of all his successors before them;[9] verily the Imāms have with them all the books revealed from God and they know them in spite of their different languages;[10] no one has completely compiled the whole of the Qur'ān but the Imāms and they have perfect knowledge of it;[11] the knowledge of the Great Name of God has been given to the Imāms.[12]

1. ibid, v.1, p.190.
2. ibid, v.1, p.194.
3. ibid, v.1, p.196.
4. ibid, v.1, p.210.
5. ibid, v.1, p.213.
6. ibid, v.1, p.213.
7. ibid, v.1, p.214.
8. ibid, v.1, p.219.
9. ibid, v.1, p.223.
10. ibid, v.1, p.227. Once a Khurāsānī came to Mūsā Kāzim, the Seventh Imām, and spoke to him in Arabic and the Imām answered in Persian...; and said: 'Verily the speech of no man, bird, animal, nor of any living thing is hidden from the Imām; one who does not possess this quality is not an Imām.' (See, ibid, v.1, p.285).
11. ibid, v.1, p.228.
12. ibid, v.1, p.230.

These Chapter-headings explicitly depict the Shīʿī outlook towards the Imāmah and these bear sufficient evidence that the believers can in no way escape the Divine control of all their religious affairs.

iv. The Sunnī reaction in confrontation with the Shīʿī doctrine of Divine Imāmah:

The spiritual status of the Imāms as depicted in the Shīʿī traditions unites their status with the Prophets of the second category who do not give a new Sharīʿah (Law) but act upon the Law given by the preceding Apostle. According to the Sunnīs this aspect of their belief in the Imāmah conflicts with the fundamental doctrine of Khatm al-Nubūwah that Muḥammad is the Seal of the Prophets and after him there is no Prophet to be born. Shāh Walī Allāh, the chief traditionist of Delhī (1176 A.H.) comments upon this doctrine of the Shīʿīs as follows:

> According to the Shīʿīs the Imām is sinless, one to whom obedience is obligatory, one who is appointed for the creature and one for whom they suggest a secret revelation. So they are really rejecting the fact that the Prophethood has come to an end, although they declare that Muḥammad is the seal of the Prophets.[1]

He further says in a discussion that one who gives the definite and agreed issues of Islām another interpretation is a zindīq; and he states therein:

> A person may say that the Prophet is the seal of Prophethood, and this means that there will be no one to whom the name of Prophet could be given; but, nevertheless, as regards the purported meaning of the Prophethood, he may say that a man is raised by God, the Exalted, for the people, a man to whom obedience is obligatory, who is protected from sins and from continuing in a slip; and he may say that this meaning is to be found in the Imāms after him. Such a person is the one who comes under the category of zindīq.[2]

7. The Qualities of the Imāms.

The Qur'ān relates that, after the time of Mūsā, the

1. Shāh Wālī Allāh, Al-Tafhīmāt al-Ilāhiyah, v.2, p.244.
2. Shāh Wālī Allāh, Al-Musawwā, v.2, p.110.

chiefs of the Banū Isrā'īl asked their Prophet (Samuel) to raise up a leader that they might fight in the way of God; their Prophet told them that God had raised Ṭālūt (Saul) to be a King over them. They asked how he could be endowed with kingship over them while they had a greater right to kingship than he and while he had not been granted an abundance of wealth? The Prophet said:

> Surely God has chosen him in preference to you and He has increased him abundantly in knowledge and physique and God grants His kingdom to whom He pleases.[1]

This suggests that apart from having faith in the Prophet there is need for a leader and knowledge and power are essential with which that leader should have been endowed.

i. The Sunnī outlook:

(a) Knowledge and power.

Abū Manṣūr ʻAbd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī (429 A.H.) states:

> Our Scholars say that the man who possesses four qualities deserves appointment as Imām. Firstly, he shall have knowledge, the minimum requirement of which is that he should have reached the rank of the mujtahidūn in respect of the lawful and the forbidden and all other sections of law. Secondly, he should have justice and abstinence, the minimum requirement of which is that his witness should be acceptable in forbearance and presentation. Thirdly, he should be well-acquainted with political affairs and with their proper settlement so as to have known the positions of the people and so as to have regarded those positions... Fourthly, he should come from the tribe of Quraysh and the Shīʻīs have added that he should have been protected from sins.[2]

The minimum requirement of knowledge whereby he should have reached the rank of the mujtahidūn has not been corroborated by later Sunnī scholars. If the Imām seeks guidance from a mujtahid and he himself has not attained the rank of a Mujtahid they do not regard it as wrong. In regard to the other requirements we see the same out-look in the eleventh century as follows:

1. S 2:247.
2. Abū Manṣūr al-Tamīmī, Uṣūl al-Dīn, p.277.

Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī (1014 A.H.) states:

> It is required that the Imām should be apt for perfect independent leadership, that he should be a Muslim, a man, sensible, adult, capable of managing affairs with the strength of his opinion and attitude, with ability, and with help from his ability to inspire awe, and from his majesty; he should be strong in respect of knowledge, justice, sufficiency and bravery in order to enforce the law and safeguard the boundaries of Islām and to fetch back the right of the oppressed from the oppressor if any oppressions occur; and he is not to be deposed for immorality or tyranny.[1]

(b) The tribe of Quraysh.

Al-Bukhārī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

> The leaders are from among the tribe of Quraysh.

He, then, reports Muʿāwīyah, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> Verily the affair (of rule) is with the Quraysh so long as they enforce the religion; no one will try to oppose them but that God will throw him down on his face.[2]

Al-Bukhārī allows that there can even be an Abyssinian as an Imām if he has been set over the community. Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> Listen and obey the Imām, even if an Abyssinian slāve has been set over you.[3]

This shows that the Imām's having come down from the Quraysh need not be an essential attribute of the Imām but only a condition for his election. Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) states as follows:

> Verily the Khilāfah is peculiarly for the Quraysh; it is not right to establish it for any other family; and the consensus

1. Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, op.cit., p.180.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.78.
3. ibid, v.9, p.78. It is implied that in this position he is not a slave although he had been a slave some time back.

> had established this in the time of the Companions and in the times after them.... Qāḍī says that the condition of the Imām's being a Qurayshī is the opinion of all the scholars, and that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar argued with this tradition against the Anṣār on the Day of Saqīfah and no one made any objection to it. Qāḍī says that scholars have mentioned it among the agreed theories and no statement or action against it has been traced back to any of the early scholars.[1]

Ibn Khaldūn (808 A.H.) says that the purported meaning of this tradition is to lay stress on the obedience to the Imām and his being an Abyssinian is merely a tamthīl (parable) and that the Prophet had adduced an example of the Imām's coming from a low position.[2] He refutes the opinion of Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī who does not acknowledge the Imām's coming from the Family of Quraysh as an essential condition. Ibn Khaldūn then says:

> We have established it as essential that the Imām should have come from a family whose family relationship would have been dominating over all its relations.... The support of relations which the Quraysh enjoyed had no instance in any other circle throughout the world.[3]

This points out that the Imām should have acquired dominating power so as to control and govern all the affairs of the State.

(c) The full control of the affairs:

It is the most essential attribute of the Imāmah that the Imām should have the full control of the affairs of the State. The condition of the Imām's being from the Family of Quraysh is only to provide an extensive and powerful support to the law and order.

Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī (1253 A.H.) asserts that unless the Imām attains full power to govern the affairs his leadership is not to be accepted as established. He states:

1. Al-Nawawī, op.cit., v.2, p.119.
2. Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddamah, p.222.
3. ibid, p.224.

> The ruler is accepted as duly appointed by virtue of two things; firstly that the prominent men should have taken the oath of allegiance to him, and secondly that his command should have been enforced upon his public, causing them to fear his strictness. So, if the oath of allegiance has been taken but the command has not been enforced because of his inability to control them, then he is not an established ruler.[1]

Al-Bukhārī holds that it is not essential for the Imām to be above all wrong, but he may commit a wrong for which he can be questioned by the public. He holds that in spite of this his command will be accepted as enforced; but if he commands something unlawful, he should not be obeyed therein. This idea is elaborated in his Chapter-heading as follows:

> Listening and obedience to the Imām so long as it is not a sin.[2]

Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī (429 A.H.) agrees with this idea:

> The majority of the Muslim community believes that protection from sin is among the conditions of Prophethood and Apostleship, but it is not considered among the conditions for the Imāmah.[3]

ii. The Shīʿī outlook:

The Shīʿīs agree with most of the above-quoted Sunnī outlook in respect of the qualities of an Imām but they do not agree that the Imām is not above sin. They believe that although they are human beings and subject to all human affairs yet they are Divinely protected from sins.

(a) The Nature of the Imāms.

Al-Kashshī (fourth century A.H.) reports Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion, as saying that ʿAlī is Khayr al-bashar (a good man),[4] Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (436 A.H.) discusses the bravery of ʿAlī and then comments as follows:

1. Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī, op.cit., v.4, p.423.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.78.
3. Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī, op.cit., p.278.
4. Al-Kashshī, op.cit., p.42; al-Ṭabarsī, op.cit., v.1, p.203.

> Verily he possessed bravery rightly as you mentioned and it was his excellence, but it had not reached such an extent as to overcome all the creatures and to fight against all the people. In spite of this bravery of his he was a bashar experiencing the phases of strength and weakness, fearing and having peace; and taqīyah (pious dissimulation) is lawful for the bashar (human beings).[1]

Al-Kulaynī reports that it is possible that the Imām may forget and he believes that the Imāms were not super-human persons. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, reports that his father (al-Bāqir) took the post coition bath; but part of his body remained unwashed; and when this was brought to the notice of the Imām he said:

> What would have happened to you (the one who pointed it out) if you had kept silent?[2]

The Imām, then, wiped that place of his body with his hand.

Al-Māmaqānī states that there is some difference of opinion among the Shī'is as to whether the Prophet can forget. He quotes al-Ṭabarsī as holding that it is right that the Prophet may forget; but they all agree that such a belief is not a cause of spiritual immorality.[3] So it is not objectionable that the Imām may forget.

(b) The sinless status of the Imāms.

It is agreed among the Shī'is that the Imāms are Divinely protected from sins. Al-Kulaynī reports that Sadīr asked Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, why there were the people who believed that they (the Imāms) were man-God, reciting:

> And he it is Who is God in the heavens and God on the earth.[4]

The Imām, then, answered:

> O Sadīr! my ear, eye, skin, flesh, blood and hair are wearied by them and God is disgusted with them. They do not agree with my Religion

1. Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, Kitāb al-Shāfī, p.400.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.45.
3. Al-Māmaqānī, op.cit., v.1, p.208.
4. S 43:84.

> nor with the Religion of my fathers. By God He will not unite us on the Last Day.... We are the treasurers of God's knowledge; we are the interpreters of God's command and we are protected from sins; God made obedience to us obligatory and forbade disobedience to us; we are the conclusive argument for all who are beneath the sky and on the earth.[1]

Al-Kulaynī further reports al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, as saying:

> The Imām is purified from sins and free from defects.[2]

Sayyid Ḥaydar al-Āmulī (eighth century A.H.) corroborates this statement of the Imām as follows:

> It is necessary that the Imām should have been protected from sins; and this protection from sin is a secret affair which is not known to anyone except God, as no one knows the hidden but God. So it is obligatory for God to appoint the Imām and not for anyone else; or it may be for the Prophet, the one protected from sins, to appoint the Imām so that his (the Imām's) statement is the statement of the Prophet and his action is the action of the Prophet.[3]

(c) <u>The Power to control the State affairs</u>:

It is most important that the Imām should have power to control the affairs of the State. ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, states as follows:

> O people! Verily the most deserving man for these affairs (of the state) is the most powerful among them therein; and the most knowing among them concerning the command of God therein.[4]

If the Imām lacks the power to control the people and rule over them it is desirable for him to keep aloof from politics and he should maintain his spiritual status and guide the people in their prayers, doctrines, and ethical

1. Al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.269-70.
2. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.200.
3. Ḥaydar al-Āmulī, <u>Jāmiʿ al-Asrār</u>, pp.247-48.
4. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.105.

affairs. The Imām can act under taqīyah (pious dissimulation) if he is helpless to meet the situation; otherwise the Imām's being powerful is one of the basic requirements of Imāmah. ʿAlī refers to the verses of the Qurʾān which mention the leadership of Ṭālūt and then concludes:

> O people! Verily there is a lesson for you in these verses; so that you may know that God has placed the matter of the Khilāfah and the rule after the Prophets upon their children; and that He benefited Ṭālūt and preferred him over all of the people by selecting him for his being abundant in knowledge and physique.[1]

The Qurʾān does not mention that Ṭālūt was among the children of Samuel, the Prophet of that time; but all of the Banū Isrāʾīl were the children of Yaʿqūb, the grandson of Ibrāhīm. The criteria for Imāmah which are mentioned here are only knowledge and power.

(d) The recognition of the Imām.

It is necessary that the Imām should be recognised and acknowledged. It is not really the quality of an Imām but the right for his ritual and spiritual status which is due to him from the public. According to the Sunnī belief the Imāms are not God-sent; so it is not unbelief if anyone does not admit that there is an Imām[2], although it amounts to immorality. But according to the Shīʿī Faith the Imāms are the Divine authorities, as has already been observed, and it is obligatory, according to them, that the Imām should have been acknowledged. Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imam, as saying:

> We are the people to whom God made obedience obligatory. The people have no excuse but to acknowledge us and no excuse from them is acceptable for their ignorance regarding us. One who has acknowledged us is a believer and one who has rejected us is an unbeliever and one who has neither recognised us nor rejected us is misled.[3]

1. Al-Ṭabarsī, op.cit., v.1, p.253.
2. See, Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.242.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.187. This view-point finds support in another statement of the Fifth Imām. (See, ibid, v.3, p.247).

This tradition also throws light upon the fact that the Divine status of the Imāmah is different, to some extent, from the Divine status of the Prophethood. The silence in respect of the latter provides no excuse for anyone. Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, points out another difference: that the Imām hears the voice (of the angel) but does not see and observe the angel.[1]

8. A brief sketch of the established Imāmah.

i. The Sunnī outlook.

Al-Bukhārī reports Jābir b. Samurah, the Companion (50 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> 'There will be (after me) twelve Amīrs (rulers).[2]

Jābir then said: 'The Prophet then said something which I could not hear (understand). My father told me that the Prophet had added: "All of whom would belong to Quraysh"'.

Muslim reports Jābir as transmitting from the Prophet:

> This Religion will continue to be strong, blocking (everyone from interference) up to twelve Khalīfahs.[3]

Abū Dā'ūd reports Jābir as giving the complete statement, transmitting from the Prophet:

> Islām will continue to be established during the time of the twelve Caliphs; the people will agree upon everyone of them...; all of them will belong to Quraysh.[4]

This report predicts the external strength of Religion and State; but it does not say that the internal observance of the Religion will be strong nor that every one of these twelve rulers will be strong in his Religion. There could be those pious successors of the Prophet who observed their Religion well in their daily life like the orthodox Caliphs

1. ibid, v.1, p.176.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.101.
3. Muslim, op.cit., v.6, p.3.
4. Abū Dā'ūd, op.cit., v.2, p.588.

and there could also be their successors who were not so strong in the exercise of their Religion; so that it was only the position of the state which was safe and strong during their reign.

Moreover this suggests that everyone of these twelve Amīrs should have the support of all the community and that all the people should have agreed upon their leadership. So no ʿAbbāsī ruler is to be reckoned among these twelve because the Muslims of Spain had not accepted the ʿAbbāsī rule but continued their Umawī khilāfah.

There is an indication in this report that these twelve Amīrs will not all belong to any one particular branch of the Quraysh but that they will come from various branches of this tribe; otherwise they will have been acknowledged in the name of that specific branch of the Quraysh.

The Shīʿīs who believe that they all come from one branch of the Quraysh transmit this tradition with the specification. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī reports ʿAlī, the First Imām, as saying:

> Verily the Imāms are from the Quraysh who have been placed in this branch of Banū Hāshim.[1]

According to the Sunnī narration of the traditions these twelve Imāms or Amīrs or Khalīfahs come from various branches of the tribe of Quraysh and they are generally considered to be the following:

1. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq (13 A.H.)
2. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (23 A.H.)
3. ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān (35 A.H.)
4. ʿAlī b. Abū Ṭālib (40 A.H.)
5. Muʿāwiyah (60 A.H.)
6. ʿAbd Allāh b. Zubayr (73 A.H.)
7. ʿAbd al-Mālik (85 A.H.)
8. Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik (96 A.H.)
9. Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik (99 A.H.)
10. ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (101 A.H.)
11. Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik (105 A.H.)
12. Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (125 A.H.)

There are certain Imāms here with whom all the people did not agree in their own times; but afterwards the people accepted the establishment of their leadership.

ʿAlī, the fourth Orthodox Caliph, had Muʿāwiyah as his opponent who did not accept ʿAlī's succession to the foregoing Caliph ʿUthmān and opposed ʿAlī up to his death. Al-Ḥasan

1. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, op.cit., v.1, p.37.

stepped into the shoes of ʿAlī and then he withdrew in favour of Muʿāwīyah. From that time, the generality of the public recognised the Imāmah of ʿAlī[1] and of al-Ḥasan for their respective periods; and they unanimously accepted Muʿāwīyah as their ruler for the coming time. Al-Ḥasan made the two fighting forces of the Muslims unite together but as he himself withdrew; his name is not given here, although on his withdrawal the first thirty years of the orthodox Khilāfah had been completed.

ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr is the third one who attained the general acceptance of the community long after his death. Yazīd b. Muʿāwīyah succeeded his father but his government is not accepted as established for there were so many troubles in his time and he used very bad tactics in trying to settle affairs. Shāh Walī Allāh, the well-known traditionist of Delhi asserts that Yazīd is not to be reckoned in that list of the twelve Amīrs.[2]

Muʿāwīyah b. Yazīd and Marwān b. Ḥakam are not to be so reckoned by reason of the short time of their reigns and the current confusion of the affairs. Thus the succession goes to ʿAbd al-Malik. The rulers from among his descendants who ruled for a very short time or who could not overcome the troubles of their times are also not to be reckoned among the twelve. At the completion of this list of the twelve strong rulers the Muslim State split into sections. It is true that there are many differences of opinion as to who are the twelve purported here in this tradition; but the general opinion of the Sunnīs agrees with most of our observations.

ii. The Shīʿī outlook:

We have already quoted[3] the Shīʿīs' belief that all the twelve Imāms have to come from Banū Hāshim, the well-known branch of the Quraysh. They also believe that all of them will be from the children of the Prophet with the exception of ʿAlī. Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, reports the Prophet as saying:

1. See, Al-ʿAsqalānī, Iṣābah, v.2, p.270.
2. Shāh Walī Allāh, Qurrat al-ʿAynayn, p.298.
3. See, p. 228.

> Verily I, and twelve of my children and you O ʿAlī!, are the pegs of the earth; He meant the pegs and the mountains of the earth; God has pegged the earth with us so that it may not be defiled with its people. When twelve of my (these) children pass away the earth will be defiled with its people and they will not be given time.[1]

Al-Jawwād, the Ninth Imām, reports ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as saying:

> Verily there is a Grand Night of Power every year; and there come down in this Night all the affairs of that year; and after the Prophet there are trustees for this affair.

He was asked who they were. ʿAlī answered as follows:

> I and eleven from my children are the Imāms who will attain the status of being inspired.[2]

Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, comments on these twelve as follows:

> We are twelve Imāms. Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are among them and then all the Imāms are from the descendants of al-Ḥusayn.[3]

Al-Bāqir further reports Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Anṣārī, the Companion (74 A.H.), as stating:

> I went to Fāṭimah and I saw that there was a tablet with her in which there were the names of the legatees of her children. I counted the names and there were twelve and the last of them was <u>al-Qā'im</u>; three of them were Muḥammad and three of them were ʿAlī.[4]

By the twelve he meant the eleven coming down from her children became the First Imām was not from her children. If the name of the First Imām had been there then there should have been four named ʿAlī.
The three Muḥammads are the Fifth Imām al-Bāqir (114 A.H.), the Ninth Imām al-Jawwād (220 A.H.) and the Twelfth Imām al-Mahdī (born 256 A.H.); and the three ʿAlīs are the Fourth

1. Al-Kulaynī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.534.
2. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.532-3.
3. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.533.
4. <u>ibid</u>, v.1, p.532.

Imām (95 A.H.), the Eighth Imām Al-Riḍā (203 A.H.), and the Tenth Imām al-Naqī (254 A.H.). The other Five Imāms are the Second Imām al-Ḥasan (49 A.H.), the Third Imām al-Ḥusayn (61 A.H.), the Sixth Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (148 A.H.), the Seventh Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim (183 A.H.) and the Eleventh Imām al-ʿAskarī (260 A.H.).

Among these twelve the Second, the Fourth, the Seventh and the Eleventh Imāms also have the name of Abū Muḥammad whereas the Seventh, the Eighth and the Tenth Imāms bear the title of Abū al-Ḥasan.

Most of the Shīʿī reports, regarding the Twelve Imāms, state the spiritual and Divine status of these Imāms rather than their political status as being Heads of the State. There are only two who ruled for some time (ʿAlī and al-Ḥasan) and there is one (al-Mahdī) who will attain political status and will rule at the end of this world. The Third Imām (al-Ḥusayn) took part in the political life of his time, but he was killed at Karbalāʾ. The Eighth Imām al-Riḍā was given by al-Maʾmūn an opportunity to save the political affairs of the state but actual reign could not be conferred upon him.

ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, also could not achieve complete control in his tenure of the State. Al-Kulaynī reports ʿAlī as saying:

> Verily the rulers before me had worked in such a way that they intentionally disobeyed the Prophet breaking his covenant and altering his Sunnah; and if I ask the people to give up those actions and bring them back to their proper place and to the position which these affairs had in the time of the Prophet my forces will certainly leave me so that I shall remain alone or else there will remain with me few of my Shīʿīs who know my excellence and recognise the obligatory claim of my Imāmah.[1]

Al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, was asked why ʿAlī had not explained some particular points to all the people, having told those only to his sons. The Imām answered as follows:

> He feared that he would not be obeyed, and, if he had achieved firmness in his stand for the state, he would certainly have enforced the Book of God and all that was rightful.[2]

1. ibid, v.8, p.59.
2. ibid, v.5, p.556.

This suggests that ʿAlī had not achieved complete control of the public affairs up to that time. The spiritual aspect of his Imāmah has always been dominating whereas the political aspects of his Imāmah have always been troubled. The Imāmah of his ten descendants also mirrors them as spiritual heads of their community and they had nothing to do, at that time, with the politics of the State. They always struggled for the welfare of their life in the hereafter and preached the same to their followers.

The material presented in this chapter indicates that the issue of Imāmah is the most controversial point between the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs. The Shīʿīs believe in the Divine status of the Imāms and that they are divinely protected from sins. According to the Shīʿī Faith they are divinely appointed and the appointment is restricted to the Family of the Prophet. The majority of Shīʿīs hold that no Imām can be admitted from any other line than that of the sons of Fāṭimah, the daughter of the Prophet. The Sunnīs negate all these conceptions and consider the status of the Imāms to be an administrative one implying the upholding of the commandments of the Book and the Prophet.

In spite of these variant attitudes in regard to the status of the Imāms they agree that the Imāmah is the supreme leadership in all the affairs of Religion and State in succession to the Prophet. The Shīʿīs believe that when the rein of State affairs was not given into the hands of the Family of the Prophet they were forced to be content with the spiritual aspect of the Religion; otherwise the administrative rein should also have been in their hands. The Sunnīs believe that the election of the Imāms is in the hands of the Community. They accept the commandments of the Book and the Prophet as the real authority and not the Imāms (Caliphs) themselves.

These are the developing and fundamental confrontations of the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs that place Abū Bakr and ʿAlī on two divergent lines. But the early affairs of these close intimates of the Prophet as noticed in the early sources bear ample evidence that they were at one in most of their Religious and State affairs. It is also to be noticed that at the time of the compilation of the canonical books of al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī the confrontation of these two major Schools had already developed. Yet there is evidence in

the authentic reports that apart from some of the personal feelings the Companions were very close to each other in the early days of the succession to the Prophet and it is on account of later political events that the two lines grew further and further from each other. But in regard to the fundamental requirements of Religion they still stand side by side. However they differ on the doctrinal position of Imāmah more than they differ on observance of their Religion in the social and ethical fields of life. The Shīʿī Divine Imāms themselves were content with the spiritual aspect of their Imāmah.

This endorses the fact that the Hereafter is the last resort of the believers, and when all worldly efforts are ended the believers still look towards the Hereafter; they pray, supplicate, observe ethical virtues and make efforts to please their Lord and seek their 'abode in rest' therein.

Next, accordingly, we discuss the Hereafter.

Chapter V: AL-ĀKHIRAH, THE LIFE AFTER DEATH.

1. The doctrine of Al-Ākhirah.

It is one of the essential beliefs of Islām that there is a life after death. It is with this in mind that all religious efforts are made.

i. The Qur'ānic explanation.

> 1. This book, there is no doubt in it, is a guide to those who guard against evil; those who believe in the unseen and keep up prayer and spend out of what we have given them; and who believe in that which has been revealed to you and that which was revealed before you; and they are certain of the al-Ākhirah.[1]
>
> 2. Your God is One God; so as for those who do not believe in al-Ākhirah, their hearts are deniers and they are proud.[2]
>
> 3. And as to those who disbelieve and reject Our communications and the facing of the al-Ākhirah (the hereafter), these shall be brought over to the chastisement.[3]
>
> 4. These are the verses of the Book of Wisdom: A Guide and a Mercy for the doers of goodness, those who establish regular prayer and give regular charity; and they are certain of al-Ākhirah (the hereafter).[4]
>
> 5. And the world's life is not but a play and an idle sport; and certainly the abode of al-Ākhirah is better for those who fear; do you not then understand?[5]

The Qur'ān requires of all those who fear God and guard themselves against evil that they should have assured faith in the hereafter; and if they do not believe in the hereafter they are certainly unbelievers. The Sunnīs and the Shī'īs, though they differ in some details, believe in the hereafter and regard it as one of the essentials of Islamic dogma.

ii. The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Al-Bukhārī reports that the Prophet was asked once, to explain what Īmān (belief) meant. The Prophet answered:

1. S 2:2-4. 2. S 16:22. 3. S 30:16.
4. S 31:2-4. 5. S 6:32.

> Īmān requires that you believe in God, in His Angels, in meeting Him, in His Prophets and that you believe in the resurrection.[1]

Al-Bukhārī further reports ʿUbādah b. al-Ṣāmit, the Companion (34 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> If anyone testifies that there is no one to be worshipped but God alone, Who has no associate, and that Muḥammad is his servant and His Prophet, and that ʿĪsā is a servant of God and His Prophet and His Word which He cast into Maryam and a Spirit from Him, and that Paradise and hell are true, God will cause such a one to enter Paradise, no matter what he has done.[2]

This report shows that the belief in the hereafter, which consists of both Paradise and hell, is as essential as belief in the Oneness of God and the Prophethood of Muḥammad and of ʿĪsā b. Maryam.

The eminent Sunnī scholar Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī (429 A.H.) concludes from the early Sunnī scholars that it is obligatory to believe in the hereafter.[3]

iii. The approach of al-Kulaynī.

Al-Kulaynī reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> O mankind! Verily there are signs before you; so stop at these signs. And there is a limit for you; so stop at these limits. Beware! the believer acts (here) as having been between two fears, the time which has passed (and he (the believer) does not know how God will take account of that), and the time which remains (and he does not know what God has decreed for that) So the believing servant himself should prepare for himself and he should have (some good deeds) from this world of his for his Ākhirah (hereafter); this applies in his youth before his old age and in life before death. By the One in Whose Hand there is the life of Muḥammad, after this world there is no chance to acquire God's pleasure and there is no abode after this but Paradise or hell.[4]

1. Al-Bukhārī, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, v.1, p.20.
2. ibid, v.4, p.201.
3. See, Abū Manṣūr al-Tamīmī, Uṣūl al-Dīn, p.237.
4. Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, v.2, p.70.

Al-Kulaynī further reports ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, the fourth Imām, as stating:

> Verily this world is going back and al-Ākhirah is advancing; there are children for each of them. So be among the people of al-Ākhirah and refrain from being the people of this world; and keep among those who relinquish in this world and possess in the next world.[1]

The Imām further states that al-Ākhirah is a true promise where there will be the command of a Powerful King.[2] ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, lays stress on regard for the hereafter as follows:

> Verily this world is going back and it is bidding farewell; and verily al-Ākhirah is coming forth. Beware! the time for preparation is today and the time for taking the lead is tomorrow. Surpassing is Paradise and the destination is otherwise hell.[3]
>
> O mankind! This world is nothing but a transitory abode and al-Ākhirah is a permanent abode; so prepare in this transitory world for your permanent world.[4]

There are numerous statements of ʿAlī which call the believers to have faith in the hereafter and to prepare in this world for the next life.[5] Al-Kulaynī and the other Shīʿī traditionists report so many traditions that the belief in the hereafter has attained celebrity and one who does not believe in it is certainly an unbeliever. Al-Majlisī states that it is one of the essentials of Islām and it is obligatory to believe in the hereafter and one who does not believe in that is an unbeliever.[6]

2. The Rajʿah, the life after death in this world.

The Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs hold variant doctrines on this issue. The Sunnīs believe that death is a pass to the hereafter, the first phase of which is the barzakh and the second

1. ibid, v.2, pp.131-2.
2. ibid, v.2, p.63.
3. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, Nahj-al-Balāghah, v.1, pp.66-7.
4. ibid, v.2, p.209.
5. See, ibid, v.1, pp.106, 147; v.2, pp.213, 238, 246.
6. Al-Bāqir al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.222.

stage of which will begin at the resurrection. But the Shīʿīs believe that after death there is a raj‘ah (return) to this material world. The most virtuous and the most wicked men will re-appear in this world. In their confrontation the good will find new life but the wicked will face retaliation; and they will then pass to the hereafter.

i. The Qurʾānic verses with comparative explanation of the two Schools.

The Shīʿīs refer to some verses of the Qurʾān which state that after death the people will be raised and that there is a life after death. They interpret these verses as to be relating to raj‘ah and the time of the living Imām (al-Mahdī). Al-Majlisī says:

> Verily most of the verses which relate to ba‘th (to have been raised after death) have been interpreted as to be relating to raj‘ah.[1]

Al-Majlisī has not given here those verses but in another work of his he refers to some verses in this context.[2] We give here some of them with the two schools' interpretation in brief.

(a) Selection of the people for gathering.

> And on the day when we will gather from every nation a party from among those who rejected our āyāt (communications) then they shall be formed into groups.[3]

(i) The Shīʿī explanation.

We have already stated that the Shīʿīs believe that only the most virtuous and the most wicked people have to come back to this world, not all the human beings; and that there will be selection of the people for this return.[4] Al-Majlisī argues from the above-quoted verse that selection from every nation suggests that it does not relate to the gathering on the last Day because there will be no exception on that day for anyone. The Qurʾān says:

1. Al-Majlisī, Mirʾat al-ʿUqūl, v.1, p.372.
2. Al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.203.
3. S 27:83.
4. See, Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.236.

> And the day on which We shall cause the mountains to pass away and you will see the earth as a levelled plain; and We will gather them and leave not anyone of them behind.[1]

(ii). The Sunnī explanation.

The Sunnīs interpret this verse in terms that suggest that from all the nations the different species of wicked persons will gather together and the different classes will be made up according to their miscreancy and sins. The division into groups has been given in another verse of the Qur'ān and it relates to the matter of resurrection. The Qur'ān says:

> And on the day that the enemies of God shall be brought together to the fire, they shall be formed into groups.[2]

But contrary to this explanation, the Shī'is hold that the verse relates to raj'ah and the āyāt mean here the Imāms.[3]

(b) The beast of the earth.

Al-Majlisī refers also to the following verse of the Qur'ān in this context and he holds that it predicts the re-appearance of 'Alī in this world.

> And when the word shall come to pass against them, we shall bring forth for them a dābbah (creature) from the earth which shall inflict its mark upon them.[4]

(i.) The Shī'ī explanation.

Al-Kulaynī reports 'Alī, the Commander of the Faithful, as making the following statement:

> Verily I am master of the turns (one who returns again and again) and the empire of the empires (one who overcomes all the powers); and verily I am the master of the sceptre and an iron instrument which causes the mark; and the creature which will wound (mark) the people.[5]

1. S 18:47.
2. S 41:19.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.203.
4. S 27:82.
5. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.198.

Muhammad b. Kaʿb reports that ʿAlī said that the creature will not have a tail but it will be wearing a beard.[1]

Saʿd b. ʿAbd Allāh reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as transmitting from ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as follows:

> It will be a creature which will take food, walk in the markets and will marry women.[2]

Al-Majlisī asserts, and there is no dispute among the Shīʿīs in this context, that the creature is ʿAlī. He states:

> There is a report in many traditions that ʿAlī is the purported meaning of this creature which will appear before the Last Day; he will be possessing the stick of Mūsā and the ring of Sulaymān. He will hit the stick between the two eyes of the believers and make a mark therein showing that he is a believer; and will mark the ring between the two eyes of the unbelievers and it will be the mark that he is an unbeliever ... Al-Zamakhsharī (538 A.H.) reports that he will appear out of the mountain al-Ṣafā.[3]

(ii) The Sunnī explanation:

The Sunnī traditionists report that the appearance of that creature from the mountain, al-Ṣafā, is one of the signs of the Last Hour, but they do not admit that the creature which is mentioned in the Qurʾān is ʿAlī nor that he has to reappear in this world.

Muslim reports Ḥudhayfah b. Asīd, the Companion (42 A.H.), as mentioning that the Companions were discussing the Last Hour and the Prophet came upon them. The Prophet then said:

> It will not come till you have seen ten signs before it; the smoke, the dajjāl, the dābbah (the beast), the rising of the Sun in its place of setting, the descent of ʿĪsā b. Maryam, Yājūj and Mājūj (Gog and Magog), three subsidences, one in the East, one in the West, and one in

1. Al-Majlisī, Mirʾat al-ʿUqūl, v.1, p.150.
2. ibid., v.1, p.151. With reference to Kitāb al-Baṣāʾir.
3. Al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, p.203.

> Arabia, at the end of which a fire will come forth from Yaman which will drive mankind to their place of assembling.[1]

Muslim further reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr (67 A.H.) and Abū Hurayrah,(57 A.H.), the Companions, as transmitting from the Prophet respectively:

> The first of the signs to appear will be the rising of the Sun in its place of setting and the coming forth of the al-dābbah (beast) against mankind in the forenoon; whichever of them comes first will soon be followed by the other.[2]

> Hasten to do good deeds before six things happen: the dajjāl, the smoke, the beast of the earth, the rising of the sun in its place of setting, the affair which will affect all mankind and which will affect you in particular (the Last Hour and the death).[3]

Al-Nawawī (676 A.H.) comments:

> The beast which has been mentioned in this tradition is the same which has been mentioned in the Word of God. 'And when the word shall come to pass against them, we shall bring forth for them a creature from the earth which shall inflict its mark upon them.'[4] The Commentators say that it is a big beast which will appear from a rock of al-Ṣafā, the mountain, and it is reported from ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b. ʿĀṣ (67 A.H.) that the beast is the Jassāsah[5] which is mentioned in the tradition which mentions dajjāl.[6]

1. Muslim, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, v.8, p.179.
2. ibid, v.8, p.208.
3. ibid, v.8, p.208.
4. S 27:82.
5. Tamīm al-Dārī, a Christian who came to the Prophet, made allegiance to him and embraced Islām, narrated to the Prophet that he had sailed in a ship along with thirty men of Lakhm and Judhām and that they were storm-tossed for a month. They drew near to an island when the sun was setting, and going into the ship's small boats they went ashore where they were met by a very hairy beast whose hair was so abundant that because of it they could not tell its front from its back. They said, 'Woe to you! What can you be?' and it replied, 'I am the Jassāsah (one which is to seek for news to take it to others).' It further told, 'Go to that man in the monastery, for he is anxious to get news of you.' They went off quickly and entered the monastery where they found a man with the hugest and strongest frame they had ever seen with his hands joined to his neck and in irons from the knees to the ankles. They asked, 'Woe to you! Who are you?' And he answered that they had the opportunity of knowing about him, so they must tell him who they were? They said that they were Arabs who had sailed in a ship and they told him the whole story. He told them after making some inquiries that he was the antichrist and would soon be permitted to come forth. (See, Muslim, v.8, p.205).
6. Al-Nawawī, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, v.2, p.393.

This is the Sunnī explanation of the creature which has been mentioned in the Qur'ān and according to their traditions there is no suggestion of raj'ah, the return of any deceased to this world, but the Shī'ī traditionists interpret it as telling of the return of 'Alī to this world.

It should not be combined with the doctrine of metempsychosis as it does not suggest that raj'ah is the full punishment for the unbelievers but it is merely a fulfilment of the promise which was given to the believers for their success and honour in this world.[1] The Shī'īs believe that there is another day of requital and it is in the hereafter that everyone will be rewarded or punished for his deeds or mischief; but the doctrine of raj'ah has influenced the Shī'ī faith to the extent that they do not regard belief in this transmigration as being kufr (unbelief). Al-Majlisī says:

> The Tanāsukhīyah (those who believe in metempsychosis) are unbelievers for their not believing in resurrection and the reward and the punishment (in the hereafter). They believe that the soul returns to those physical bodies and that it transmigrates from the body of Zayd to the body of 'Amr or it unites with the body of an animal in this world; and they believe that there is no hereafter and that the reward and the punishment is only in this world. They believe that the souls are Qadīm and they do not believe in the Creator of this universe; and they do not admit the Prophets as being sent by God and they say that the restrictions (which are laid on human beings) are (at times) lifted. They are unbelievers for these false doctrines of theirs, and not for their belief in metempsychosis.[2]

(c) Coming back to the place of return.

Al-Majlisī has also referred to the following verse of the Qur'ān and asserts that there is a prediction in the Qur'ān that the Prophet will also re-appear in this world at its end. He quotes the Qur'ān:

> Verily He who has made the Qur'ān binding on you will bring you back to the place of return.[3]

1. Al-Majlisī has referred to this verse of the Qur'ān in this context: Most surely we help our Apostles, and those who believe, in the world's life and on the day when the witness shall stand up. S 40:51.
2. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.228.
3. S 28:85.

(i) The Shīʿī explanation:

ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (307 A.H.), one of the teachers of al-Kulaynī, comments that there is a prediction of rajʿah (of the Prophet) in this verse.[1]

(ii) The Sunnī explanation:

Al-Bukhārī says that this is a prediction for the Prophet's victorious return to Mecca and Maʿād means here the city of Mecca. He reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), as explaining this word as follows:

> Bringing you back to the place of return means bringing you to Mecca.[2]

This explanation of al-Bukhārī does not contradict the explanation of maʿād as being a place after death because the Prophet's victory over Mecca and his death coincide with each other; and it is the place of return of which the Prophet has been informed in this verse.

Al-Bukhārī explains in another chapter the victorious return to Mecca as being an indication of the Prophet's death. On being asked by ʿUmar, the Commander of the Faithful, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās explained the verse of the Qurʾān 'When there comes the help of God and the victory'[3] as follows:

> It tells of the death of the Prophet which God intimated to him.[4]

Ibn Kathīr (774 A.H.) harmonises between the different exegeses of the verse mentioning maʿād; but in none of them is there any indication of rajʿah, the coming back of the Prophet to this world. Ibn Kathīr says:

> According to the interpretation of Ibn ʿAbbās and ʿUmar, the Prophet has been given the news of his soul's departure and it says, 'Know that when you achieve victory over Mecca, the city from where you had been put out, and the people accept God's religion in companies then our concern with you in this world will be completed; so be prepared for your coming to us'.[5]

1. Al-Qummī, Tafsīr al-Qurʾān, v.2, p.147.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.6, p.142.
3. S 110:1.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.6, p.221, 11.
5. Ibn Kathīr, Tafsīr, v.4, p.562.

(d) The nearer chastisement before the greater chastisement.

Al-Majlisī refers to the following verse also in this context and argues that the nearer chastisement relates to raj'ah. The Qur'ān says:

> And most certainly we will make them taste of the nearer chastisement, that haply they may turn.[1]

The last words of this verse explain that it relates to a time when they could be benefited for their having turned, the time before death so that they might leave evil and do good. After death there is no conception of turning to the right and there is no use then in accepting the truth. However the Sunnī scholars mean by the near chastisement the earthly punishment which might serve as a warning against the greater punishment of the hereafter. Apparently there is no basis in this verse which could lead one to the doctrine of raj'ah except the word Yarji'ūn and we have already explained it here.

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī in regard to the Raj'ah.

Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, was asked what the blessing on the Prophet meant? The Imām answered as follows:

> Verily when God, the Blessed and the Excellent, created His Prophet, his legatee, his daughter, his two sons and all the Imāms and all their Shī'īs, He took covenant with them that they should be patient and excel in endurance and remain steadfast and fear God; and He promised them that He would hand over to them the earth in which there is blessing, and the Holy place (haram), in which there is peace, and that He would bring al-Bayt al-Ma'mūr (the delightful House) near to them and make the elevated roof open to them, and that He would give them relief from their enemy. So the earth would have been caused to be changed by God into the state of Salām and God would give them the charge of all its contents. There would be no spot on it and no dispute with their enemies and there would be everything which they liked. The Prophet took this covenant from all the Imāms and their Shī'īs;

1. S 32:21.

> and the al-Salām is a reminder of that covenant's [illegible]ing on God, and of its renewal, so that He, the Glorified and the Mighty, might cause it soon and might bring to you soon (the valley of) al-Salām with all its contents.[1]

This report predicts a very happy and delightful life for the Imāms in this world and predicts that God will most certainly, after their fear, give them security in exchange. The History says that the Imāms could not have had such a life here, in this world, in the past; so it suggests that they have to return to this world again so that God's promise may be fulfilled. The Shīʿī traditionist al-Rāwandī in Al-Kharāʾij gives a report which he traces back to al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, who stated that al-Ḥusayn, before the battle of Karbalāʾ, spoke to his companions as follows:

> Receive good news! By God if they kill us we shall go to our Prophet; then I shall stay there so long as God pleases; then I shall be the first above whom the earth will split open and I shall come out at the same time as the Commander of the Faithful (ʿAlī) will be coming out (from his grave); and the Living Imām among us (the Family of the Prophet) will take his last stand; then there will come upon me the heavenly deputation from God...; then I shall kill all the animals whose meat is forbidden by God...; and the heavenly blessings will come down upon the earth...; and there is the Word of God,[2] 'And if the people of the towns had (truly) believed and guarded (against evil) We would certainly have opened up for them blessings from the heavens and the earth, but they rejected Us; so We overtook them for what they had earned.'[3]

All the Shīʿīs who believe in the twelve Imāms believe in rajʿah and al-Kulaynī is not an exception; but it is a fact that al-Kulaynī is not very clear on this issue. In spite of its being one of the essentials of the Shīʿī Faith he does not lay down an independent Chapter-heading for this issue. Al-Majlisī mentions the Shīʿī traditionists who have worked on this issue, but he does not mention al-Kulaynī therein. This suggests that up to that time this had not

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.1, p.451.
2. S 7:96.
3. Al-Majlisī, Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl, v.1, p.373.

attained the status of being as one of the essentials of the Shī'ī faith. Al-Majlisī says:

> There is a consensus of the Shī'īs on raj'ah; moreover it is one of the essentials of the rightful sect that before the last Day, in the time of the Living Imām, certain of the top-most virtuous people and certain of the top-most wicked people will return to this world. The virtuous people will come back so that by seeing the kingdom of the Imāms they may illuminate their eyes and have a reward for some of their virtuous deeds in this world; and the wicked ones will be returned for punishment and chastisement in this world, and to see that there are manifold forms of the empire which they had not wanted to go to the Family of the Prophet, and to see that the Shī'īs might have to take revenge upon them. As regards the other people they shall remain in their graves till they are raised on the last Day as it has been reported in many traditions that only those will be returned to this world who have pure belief or who have completely rejected it; and the other people would be left to their own devices. Most of the Imāmī scholars have claimed consensus that raj'ah is a fact, as does Muḥammad b. Bābawayh (381 A.H.) in (his) booklet of doctrines, Shaykh Mufīd (413 A.H.), Sayyid Murtaḍā (436 A.H.), Shaykh Ṭabarsī (early 6th century A.H.), Sayyid b. Ṭā'ūs and other eminent Shī'ī scholars; and in the past there have been continuous discussions between the Shī'īs scholars and their opponents; and many of the Shī'ī traditionists have compiled independent booklets on this issue as the writers of the biographies have mentioned. Shaykh Ibn Bābawayh has transmitted from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, in man la Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh that one who did not believe in raj'ah and does not regard mut'ah (a form of marriage) as being lawful is not from among us. I have written more than two hundred traditions from more than forty Imāmī scholars who have given them in fifty trustworthy early works which are known as aṣl.[1]

Although al-Majlisī has not mentioned al-Kulaynī among those who have worked on this issue yet he quotes many traditions from al-Kulaynī which prove that al-Kulaynī already believed in the doctrine of raj'ah irrespective of the fact that he has not transmitted them under some particular Chapter-heading for this particular issue. Yet there is a glimpse in these lines of al-Majlisī that in the very early days this had not attained the status of the essentials of

1. Al-Majlisī, Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, pp.202-3.

Shīʿī Faith. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī reports ʿAlī, the Imām, as saying:

> The time of life which has passed its rajʿah is not expected.[1]

This suggests that there is no return of this world's life.

iii. <u>The approach of al-Bukhārī on the point at issue</u>.

Al-Bukhārī believes that in this world there is no life after death and, with death, the next world's affairs begin. The grave is the first step to <u>al-Ākhirah</u> and on resurrection, there will be the complete realisation of <u>al-Ākhirah</u>. It is true that there is life in the grave but it is not an apparent phase of life but a close and concealed relationship between the spirit and the body which after the questions of the angels turns feeble. We shall discuss this later;[1a] here we say that, according to al-Bukhārī, there is no death after the death in this world. He reports that when the Prophet expired Abū Bakr came and kissed the forehead of the Prophet and said:

> May my parents be sacrificed for you O Prophet of God! God will not cause death to you twice. The death, which had been decreed for you, you have already observed.[2]

If there had been any conception that the most virtuous people would return to this world after death, they would then have to face another death for their transfer to the hereafter, but this statement of Abū Bakr rejects any such suggestion. It should be noted here that no other Companion expressed any different opinion on that occasion.

It is true that according to the Sunnī Faith there is life in the grave and the deceased are asked questions therein but this is not a life in this world but is reckoned among the affairs of the hereafter. ʿUthmān, the Commander of the Faithful, reports the Prophet as saying:

1. Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.1, p.224.
2. Al-Bukhārī, <u>op.cit</u>., v.2, p.90; v.6, p.17.

1a. See, p. 262

> The grave is the first stage of <u>al-Ākhirah</u> (the next world); if one escapes from it, what follows is easier than it, but if one does not escape from it, what follows is more severe than that.[1]

Moreover the life in the grave is a very short and hidden life during which the deceased is asked questions; but this life can in no case be considered as real life so as to make possible a second death in the grave. The restoration of the soul to the body and its coming out are not the real life and death. The eminent traditionist of Delhi, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz says:

> There is no real life and death in the grave; it is only a reflection of the rays of the soul on the body and this reflection does not cause growth or need for food.[2]

It is also a fact that this life followed by death does not apply to the Prophets; but their life in their graves is not followed by another death therein.[3] Here we want to make a point that al-Bukhārī reports that there is no second death for the Prophet, neither in this world (as the conception of <u>rajʿah</u> requires) nor in the grave (as, according to some scholars, occurs to all others).

Al-Bukhārī holds that it is decreed that the deceased do not have to return to this world. Under the main Book-heading of Predestination he refers to the following verse:

> And it is binding on (the people of) a town which we destroy that they shall not return.[4]

Ibn Mājah (273 A.H.) reports Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion (74 A.H.), as saying that when his father was slain in a battle with the enemies of Islām the Prophet spoke to him as follows:

> God did not speak to anyone except from behind a veil but He spoke to your father frankly and asked him, 'O my servant! ask for a wish from me that I may confer a favour upon you.' He

1. Al-Tirmidhī, <u>Al-Sunan</u>, v.2, p.50, Ibn Mājah, <u>Al-Sunan</u>, v.2, p.294, Al-Ḥākim, <u>Mustadrak</u>, v.1, p.371.
2. Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, <u>Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAsharīyah</u>, p.238.
3. See, al-ʿAynī, <u>ʿUmdat al-Qārī</u>, v.9, p.600.
4. <u>S</u> 21:95.

> expressed a wish to stay alive (in this world) in order to be slain again for His cause. God replied (that this could not be) 'The word has gone forth from Me that they shall not return.'[1]

The concluding words here lā Yarjiʿūn are evidently the concluding words of the above-quoted verse of the Qur'ān. In the light of this tradition the verse suggests conclusively that no one who is dead returns to life in this world. It also suggests that a nation that is destroyed does not rise again. Al-Bukhārī suggests by this Chapter-heading of his that this not turning back from what has been decreed for them has already been predestined by God.[2]

Al-Majlisī answers this argument by saying that the verse relates only to those people who have already observed chastisement in this world and who according to the Shīʿī Faith, are exempted from rajʿah.[3]

Al-Bukhārī refers to the following verse of the Qur'ān and suggests that there is no return to this world.

> When those who were followed shall renounce those who followed them and they see the chastisement and their ties are cut asunder. And those who followed shall say: 'Had there been for us a return, then we would renounce them as they have renounced us'.[4]

Al-Bukhārī reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), as explaining 'and their ties are cut asunder' as follows:

> This means their connections with this world.[5]

He suggests that after death the connections with this world are completely cut asunder. This not returning to this world is not confined only to wicked people; some of the most virtuous men like the martyrs may also have a desire to return to this world as we have already quoted from Ibn Mājah and they will receive the reply that this may not be. Al-Bukhārī reports Anas b. Mālik, the Companion

1. Ibn Mājah, op.cit., v.2, p.96.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.156.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.236.
4. S 2:166-7.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.138.

(91 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> No one who passes away, for whom God means well, will be pleased to return to this world and inherit the whole of the world with all its contents except the martyr; he will wish to return to this world to be slain again for (His cause).[1]

The Qur'ān also reports that the people of Paradise will be declared as having tasted only one death.

> They shall not taste therein death except the first death and He will save them from the chastisement of hell.[2]

Al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) says that death is only one[3] and this is the doctrine of all the Sunnīs.

The eminent scholastic theologian Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī (of the 5th century A.H.) states the Sunnī doctrine in regard to _raj'ah_ as follows:

> One who believes that 'Alī, his descendants and his Shī'īs will return to this world and take revenge upon their enemies commits unbelief for having rejected the statute and (the requital of) the resurrection.[4]

The Mu'tazilīs agree with the Sunnīs on this issue and regard the doctrine of '_raj'ah_ to this world' as unbelief. Abū al-Ḥusayn 'Abd al-Raḥīm al-Khayyāṭ (291 A.H.) writes:

> Verily the Khawārij, the Murji'ah, the Mu'tazilah, the Hashawīyah, the Zaydīyah, the Jārūdīyah and all the community with the exception of the Imāmīyah (Shī'īs) reject the doctrine of _Raj'ah_ and oppose it and regard one who believes in that as an unbeliever and declare him to be beyond the pale of Islām.[5]

3. _The question as to whether it is incumbent upon God to raise the dead._

Despite basic agreement that the dead will be raised and

1. _ibid._, v.4, p.20.
2. _S_ 44:56.
3. Al-Taftāzānī, _Sharḥ al- 'Aqā'id_, p.126.
4. Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī, _Al-Tamhīd_, p.192.
5. Al-Khayyāṭ, _Kitāb al-Intiṣār_, p.96.

that they will face the judgement on the Day of requital, the Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs differ as to whether it is incumbent upon God to raise the dead and reward the virtuous and punish the wicked, or whether it is merely the enforcement of His commandments which He decreed and commanded so to act . The Sunnīs believe that there is nothing incumbent upon God and it is not wājib upon Him to do that which may be best for the creation. Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī (429 A.H.) says:

> Our scholars say that according to reason resurrection is a verity and according to the report it is necessary and the Qadarīyah and the Karrāmīyah believe that what is best is as a matter of reason incumbent upon God; so that the virtuous and the wicked may be separated (from each other) for reward or punishment. We say to the Qadarīyah : 'When it is considered right (among you) that the reward and the punishment can be hastened so as to be observed (here) before death, then, if it is so hastened, the necessity of raising the dead is lost.' We say to the Karrāmīyah .'When we and you agree that all sinners can be forgiven, then the necessity of raising the dead for the sake of punishment and reward will have been nullified, even if He treats them with such reward or punishment in the beginning (without their deeds or mischief) it is right for Him; and if the reward had been incumbent upon Him (as the Shīʿīs say) it would not have been a benefit from Him and then it would not have been a subject for gratitude; and it is unbelief to nullify the gratitude for the reward'.[1]

Al-Subkī (of the eighth century A.H.) corroborates this statement and mentions all those who believe that ʿadl (justice) is incumbent upon Him (as the Shīʿīs believe) among those who establish that it is incumbent upon God to reward the virtuous and punish the wicked. Al-Subkī says:

> Verily the Muʿtazilāh and all those who agree with them in the doctrines of ʿadl and tajwīz believe that it is incumbent upon God, Most High, to reward the virtuous and that it is obligatory upon Him to punish the wicked...; and the ahl al-Sunnah say ... that there is nothing incumbent upon God.[2]

1. Abū Manṣūr Abd al-Qāhir, op.cit., p.237.
2. Tāj al- Dīn al-Subkī, Ṭabaqāt, v.2, p.283.

He does not mean that virtues are not rewarded but he means that it is not obligatory for God to reward virtues but that His reward is a benefit from Him by which the virtuous are benefited.

i. The Qur'ānic guidance on the point at issue.

The Qur'ān establishes all the rewards from God as constituting His beneficence and His mercy which He bestows upon those whom He pleases. The Qur'ān says that the people of Paradise will admit:

> And they shall say: All praise is due to God Who has taken away grief from us; most surely our Lord is Forgiving, the Multiplier of rewards. It is He Who has, out of His Bounty, settled us in the abode of permanence.[1]

The Qur'ān establishes it as Divine mercy that we observe here some of the virtues, and if it had been incumbent upon God to do the best for creation all men would certainly have been virtuous. The Qur'ān says:

> And were it not for God's grace upon you and His mercy, not one of you would have ever been pure but God purifies whom He pleases and God is Hearing, Knowing.[2]

The Qur'ān suggests that even in this world every virtue and good is God's mercy and His Grace and what is best for human beings has never been incumbent upon God. It indicates that if it had been obligatory for Him to make the judgement on the last Day nobody would have ever entered Paradise without facing the phase of judgement; but the reported evidence, as will now be discussed, proves it.

ii. The Approach of al-Bukhārī on the point at issue.

Al-Bukhārī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

> Seventy thousand will enter Paradise without being taken to account.

He suggests that it is not incumbent upon God to take account and to do what may be the best for all of them.

1. S 35:34-5.
2. S 24:21.

It is His Grace and Bounty that He allows them to enter Paradise without being taken to account as all those who are taken to account are subject to chastisement. Al-Bukhārī reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion, as transmitting from the Prophet:

> The nations were shown to me and a Prophet began to pass by, accompanied by a nation, another accompanied by a number, another accompanied by ten men, another accompanied by five men and another accompanied by one man. Then I saw a huge crowd and I asked, 'O Jibrīl! Are these my people?' He told that they were not but he asked me to look on the horizon. Then I saw a great crowd and he said, 'Here are your people along with whom there are seventy thousand, in front of them, who will not be taken into account nor will they perish.' I asked for the cause (of this entry of theirs to Paradise) and he answered 'They were not cauterising themselves, nor using spells, nor taking omens, but they trusted in their Lord.'[1]

ʿUkkāshah b. Miḥṣan (d. about 12 A.H.) thereupon stood up and said, 'Beseech God to put me among them,' and the Prophet said, 'O God! Put him among them'. Then another man got up and said, 'Beseech God to put me among them'. The Prophet then said:

> ʿUkkāshah has anticipated you!

The preceding Chapter-heading of al-Bukhārī states as follows:

> Those who are closely examined in the reckoning will be punished.

ʿĀʾishah, the Mother of the Faithful, reports that the Prophet said:

> Everyone who is taken to account on the day of resurrection will perish.

She asked the Prophet, 'O Apostle of God! Is it not God's word?'

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, pp.124, 140; v.7, p.184. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.) reports Abū Umāmah that the Prophet said, 'My Lord has promised me to bring into Paradise seventy thousand of my people without any reckoning or punishment, each thousand accompanied by seventy thousand and three handfuls, the Handfuls of my Lord, the Mighty, the Glorified.' (Musnad, v.5, p.268). This shows that the Prophet did not mean the exact number here but the abundance in numbers.

> Then as to him who is given his book in his right hand he shall be reckoned with an easy reckoning.[1]

The Prophet then answered:

> That is merely the review, but those who are closely examined in the reckoning will be punished.[2]

Al-Bukhārī holds that on the day of resurrection there is either a manifestation of God's Benefit and Grace which will cause the virtuous people to enter Paradise or there will be an enforcement of His justice which will result in putting the wicked people into hell. This bears evidence that it is not incumbent upon God to do justice on that Day and it rejects the Shīʿī doctrine that it is incumbent upon God to raise the dead so that the virtuous may be rewarded and the wicked may be punished.

Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.), the teacher of al-Bukhārī, reports Ibn al-Daylamī, the Successor, as telling Ubayy b. Kaʿb, the Companion (19 A.H.), that he was confused about the Divine decree and that he asked him (Ubayy) to tell him something which might remove the confusion from his mind. Ubayy then said:

> Were God to punish everyone in the heavens and everyone on the earth He would do so without being unjust to them and were He to show mercy to them His mercy would be much better than their own actions merited.[3]

Ibn al-Daylamī says that he went to Ḥudhayfah (35 A.H.), then to ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd (32 A.H.), and then to Zayd b. Thābit (45 A.H.); all of them said something to the same effect, and the latter reported the same from the Prophet. Abū Ḥanīfah (150 A.H.), the Imām, elaborates this point as follows:

> God, the Exalted is conferrer of benefit and is just to His servants. At times He by His Grace confers the reward which is many times more than the servant deserves and at times, by His justice, He punishes men for their sins and at times, by His Grace, He forgives them.[4]

1. S 84:7, 8.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.139.
3. Aḥmad, op.cit., v.5, p.182.
4. Abū Ḥanīfah, Fiqh al-Akbar, p.112.

Al-Ghazālī (505 A.H.) and al-Qurṭūbī (671 A.H.) corroborate this statement as follows:

> The balance (mīzān) will not be set for everyone. Seventy thousand will enter Paradise without being taken into account. No balance will be raised for them nor will they bear the records of their actions.[1]

This does not mean that favours and bounties are not rewards for the virtues. It only suggests that reason shows that it is not incumbent upon God to reward the virtuous, but on the basis of His own declaration He will certainly give rewards for virtues, and whatever He gives as reward He confers by His Grace; and this is certain on the basis of report although not incumbent on the basis of reason.

iii. The approach of al-Kulaynī on the point at issue.

The Shīʿīs believe that it is incumbent upon God to do that which may be best for the Creation and they conclude that it is a matter of reason that it is obligatory for God to promise the reward and to cause dread of punishment. Al-Majlisī says:

> It is incumbent upon God on the basis of reason that He should act graciously; and Grace is the means which brings the one bound by a duty near to obedience to God and keeps him away from disobedience to him. These means are the sending of the Prophets, the appointments of the Imāms, the promise to the one bound by duty of reward and the causing (to them) of dread of the punishment and other such things.[2]

It is true that the Sunnīs also believe that God promises to reward virtues and that He causes dread so that they desist from their mischief; and they also believe that He will fulfil His promises; but they believe so on the basis of report not on the basis of reason. The Shīʿīs believe that Paradise is as a matter of reason the right of the virtuous which they can claim in the hereafter and that it

1. ʿAlī al-Qārī, Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar, p.114.
2. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.10.

is not simply a favour from God although they accept that He may graciously multiply the reward for some particular virtues.

Al-Kulaynī reports Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as making the following statement:

> On the day of resurrection some distinctive people will arise and they will come to the gate of Paradise and will stand at it. They will be asked who they are. They will answer, 'We are the people of patience.' They will further be asked why they observed patience? They will answer, 'We were forbearing out of obedience to God and by exercising self-restraint from disobedience to God. God, the Mighty and the Glorified, will say, "They have told the truth, ask them to enter Paradise"; and it is God's word, "only the patient will be paid back their reward in full without reckoning".'[1,2].

Al-Kulaynī suggests that the patient will regard entry to Paradise as their right and they will call at the gate of it and the verse which mentions that they will have their reward without reckoning relates to the degree of reward and not to their entry to Paradise.

4. Al-Barzakh, the state between death and the resurrection.

i. The Qur'ānic evidence of al-Barzakh.

The state between death and resurrection is the first phase of al-Ākhirah. The Qur'ān names it as barzakh meaning the barrier. The Qur'ān says that in principle the dead do not return to this world and one who has faced death is never allowed to come back to this world; and there is an intermediate state between death and the greater resurrection. The Qur'ān says:

> Until, when death comes to one of them he says, 'O my Lord! send me back; haply I may work righteousness in the things I ignored?' By no means (it cannot be so); it is but a word he says; and before them is a barrier till the day that they are raised up.[3]

1. S 39:10.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.75.
3. S 23:99-100.

The Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs agree upon this intermediate state of barzakh and in spite of having some differences over the modes of that life they agree that there is either repose and comfort or torture and pain in that life. The wicked endure the minor chastisement in that intermediate state and on the Last Day they will pass on to the major chastisement.

ii. The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Al-Bukhārī refers to three verses of the Qurʾān in his Chapter-heading in this respect, and he proves that in the intermediate state of barzakh there is punishment in the grave and that the virtuous people will prove resolute therein. Al-Bukhārī quotes the following verses:

> And if you had seen when the unjust shall be in the agonies of death and the angels shall spread forth their hands: Give up your souls: to-day you shall be recompensed with an ignominious chastisement.[1]
>
> We will chastise them twice, then shall they be turned back to a grievous chastisement.[2]
>
> And the most evil chastisement overtook Firaʿūn's people. As for the Fire, they shall be brought before it (every) morning and evening and when the Hour will be established the sentence will be, 'Make Firaʿūn's people enter the severest chastisement.'[3]

(a) The questioning in the grave.

Al-Bukhārī reports al-Barrāʾ b. ʿĀzib, the Companion (72 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet as follows:

> When the believer is caused to sit in his grave, angels come to him and he testifies that there is no God but one and that Muḥammad is His Prophet, that is verified by God's word 'God establishes those who believe in the sure word in this world's life and in the hereafter.[4,5]

1. S 6:94.
2. S 9:101.
3. S 40:45-6.
4. S 14:27.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.2, p.122.

Al-Bukhārī reports that this verse was revealed concerning the punishment in the grave. He further reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion as transmitting from the Prophet:

> When any one of you dies his final abode is shown to him morning and evening. If he is from the people of Paradise his abode is among the people of Paradise; and if he is from among the people of hell his abode is among the people of hell, (and) he is told that this is his abode to which God will finally raise him on the day of resurrection.[1]

(b) The chastisement in the grave for sinful believers.

The people of hell are the unbelievers but there will also be some sinful believers for a time. We shall discuss this later on;[1a] here we suggest that both of them are subject to the chastisement in the grave. Al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) says:

> The punishment in the grave for unbelievers and for some sinful believers, and the bliss of the obedient in the grave and the questions of Munkar and Nakīr, the angels, is proved on the basis of reported arguments.[2]

Sayf al-Ḥaqq Abū al-Muʿīn al-Nasafī states in Baḥr al-Kalām that as regards the sinful believers their punishment in the grave comes to an end from the Friday after their death and then it never occurs again,[3] but al-Bukhārī reports that the Prophet saw in a vision that the head of a man was being hurt with a stone. The Prophet asked Jibrīl and Mīkāʾīl about it and they answered:

> It is a man who kept in touch with the Qurʾān and then he neglected it and he ignored the obligatory prayer. This punishment to him will continue up to the day of resurrection.[4]

This bears witness to the fact that the chastisement in the grave is not confined to unbelievers only. Al-Bukhārī

1. ibid, v.2, p.124; v.8, p.134. 1a. See, p. 293.
2. Al-Nasafī, ʿAqāʾīd, pp.132-3.
3. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Firhārwī, Al-Nibrās, p.314.
4. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.9, p.57; v.2, pp.126-7.

further reports that there is punishment even for the sins which are not great. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.), reports that the Prophet once passed by two graves and said:

> Verily both are being punished and they are not in punishment for a great sin. Indeed, one of them went about spreading slander and the second did not keep himself covered when passing water.[1]

The Prophet then took a fresh palm branch, split it in two parts and planted one on each grave. On being asked why he did so, the Prophet said:

> Perhaps their punishment may be mitigated as long as they remain fresh.

Al-Bukhārī gives another report from Asmāʾ, the daughter of Abū Bakr, that the Prophet once delivered a speech in which he mentioned the trial which a man would have to endure in the grave. She then reports that, on his mentioning that, the Muslims gave a shout of dismay.[2] It suggests that in principle being Muslim is not an exemption from the trial in the grave.

Al-Bukhārī reports Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet as follows:

> When a man is placed in his grave and his friends leave him and he hears the beat of their sandals the two angels come to him and having made him sit up they ask, 'What was your opinion of this man, of Muḥammad?' He (the believer) replies, 'I testify that he is God's servant and His Prophet.' He is then told to look at his abode in hell for which God has substituted for him an abode in Paradise; and he sees both of them.... As regards the unbeliever and the hypocrite he is also asked what was his opinion in respect of that man and he says 'I do not know; I held the opinion which the others held.' He is then given answer, 'Neither did you know nor did you follow (the others).' He will be then given a blow with rods of iron and he will utter a shout which will be heard by all who are near to him, with the exception of men and _jinn_ (the two weighty things).[3]

1. _ibid_, v.2, p.124.
2. _ibid_, v.2, p.123.
3. _ibid_, v.2, p.123.

This shows too that hypocrites are also punished in their graves. Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), also reports from the Prophet that when the hypocrite fails to answer the questions made to him in the grave, the earth will be told to press in upon him and it will do so.[1] We shall discuss this later on;[1a] here we only point out that the trial in the grave and the chastisement therein relate to unbelievers, hypocrites and sinful believers.

The Sunnī traditionists are clear on these three points: (1) The trial in the grave and the chastisement relate to unbelievers and sinful believers, (2) it is caused to the body as well as to the soul and (3) the soul is restored to the body although there is some difference among them as to whether it departs from the body after questioning in the grave with only a brief contact between the soul and the body in the grave, or whether the soul remains therein[2] in a way which cannot be recognised and observed by the men of this world.

iii. The approach of al-Kulaynī.

According to the Shīʿī Faith the chastisement in al-Barzakh and questioning in the grave are not concerned with the sinful believers. This phase of al-Ākhirah deals with mere belief and mere unbelief. Moreover they believe that the man about whose identity the dead would be asked would be the Divine Imām. Abū Bakr al-Ḥaḍramī, the companion of al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, asked the Imām who were to be questioned in their graves? The Imām replied:

> They will be asked for mere belief and mere unbelief. As regards the other people, by God, they will be overlooked, not given any care.

The companion then asked the Imām what was the thing about which they would be asked? The Imām answered:

> They will be asked about the established authority before you. It will be asked of a believer, 'What do you say about such a son of such a one?' He will say, 'That

1. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.1, p.99. 1a. See, p. 262.
2. See, Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, Shifāʾ al-Siqām, p.159.

> is my Imām.' Then he will be told, 'Stay sleeping; God will rest your eyes' and a door to Paradise will be opened for him and by its blessing it will benefit him up to the Last Day. And it will be asked of an unbeliever, 'What do you say about such a son of such a one?' He will answer, 'I had heard tell of him but I do not know who he is'; and it will be said to him, 'You have not learnt'; and a door to hell will be opened for him and by its heat it will be tormenting him up to the Last Day.[1]

As regards the chastisement in al-Barzakh and the pressing of the grave the believers are exempted from that. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, was asked about the grave's pressing and the Imām answered:

> It will not befall the believers on any account. By God this ground (in which a believer is buried) boasts over against the other ground and says that there is a believer on its back whereas there is no believer on the other's back; and it says to the believer, 'By God, I loved you when you were walking upon my back and now when I possess you so you will know how I treat you.' It will then be widened so far as the eyesight extends.[2]

Al-Kulaynī holds here in these traditions that the believers, even if they are sinful, are not subject to any sort of chastisement in the grave nor will they be tortured there in any way. Moreover there is evidence that the man about whom the question is made in the grave is the Imām. Neverthless there are other traditions in Al-Kāfī which express the sentiment that there are very few who escape the chastisement in the grave and there are traditions which tell that the man about whom the question is made in the grave is the Prophet.

Ja'far al-Ṣādīq, the Sixth Imām, was asked whether anyone would escape the grave's pressing? The Imām answered:

> We seek God's protection from that; there are very few who escape from the grave's pressing. Verily when 'Uthmān caused the death of Ruqayyah (the daughter of the Prophet) the Prophet was

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.237.
2. ibid., v.3, p.130.

> standing by her grave; he raised his hands and his eyes were full of tears and he said to the people, 'I remembered her and considered the troubles which she met; my heart was appeased for her and I prayed for her forgiveness from the pressing of the grave'; and God forgave her for the sake of his Prophet. Verily the Prophet came out for the funeral prayer of Saʿd and he was accompanied by the seventy thousand angels. The Prophet raised his head towards the sky and said, 'A man like Saʿd is being pressed (in the grave).'

The Companion asked the Imām:

> May I be sacrificed for you. We have been told that he was careless of the spray when passing water.

The Imām then answered:

> May God protect us; he was discourteous to his family.

This indicates that the believers also are subject to the grave's pressing even for the sins which are not great.

The Imām further states that the man about whom the question is made in the grave is the Prophet. Al-Kulaynī reports the Imām as saying:

> When the dead man is buried two angels, one called Munkar and the other Nakīr, come to him; their sounds are like harsh thunder and their eyes are like lightning which may swoop down. They will be tearing the earth with their teeth and trampling on their hair. They ask the dead man who was his Lord and what was his religion? They ask him, 'What do you say about this man who came to you?' He will ask, 'Do you ask me about Muḥammad, the Prophet of God?' and will say, 'I bear witness that he is the Prophet of God.' They then say to him, 'Stay sleeping in a sleep in which there is no (dreadful) dream'; and his grave will be widened to nine yards and there will be opened a door, to Paradise and he will see his abode therein.[1]

1. ibid, v.3, p.236. It is reported in another tradition that the Imām then referred to the following verse of the Qur'ān:
   God establishes those who believe in the sure word in this world's life and in the hereafter. (S 14:27).
ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, also refers to this verse in this context and adds that there will be three questions in the grave, the third one as who was his Prophet ; and he says that he will answer that Muḥammad was his Prophet. (Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.232). Ibn Bābawayh (381 A.H.) also reports the Sixth Imām as saying, 'One who does not believe in three things, the ascension of the Prophet to the heavens, the questions in the grave and the intercession, is not reckoned among our Shīʿīs.' (Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.235). Al-Majlisī states therein that questioning in the grave is one of the essentials of Islām and one who does not believe in it is an unbeliever. (ibid, p.235).

There is some apparent dispute between these different reports of al-Kulaynī but before we comment upon this dispute it is appropriate to give here a very comprehensive statement of al-Majlisī. He says:

> The pressing in the grave and the reward and punishment therein are unanimously agreed upon among the Muslims and it is apparent from the trustworthy traditions that the pressing in the grave relates to the original body and this pressing is not general. The pressing combines the questioning therein on the principle that those who are not the subject of questioning are not the subject for pressing in the grave. ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (307 A.H.) comments upon the verse: 'And before them is a barrier until the day they are raised';[1] and he says that Barzakh is an intermediate phase between the two phases and that it means the reward and punishment between this world and the al-Ākhirah;[2] and these comments reject the opinion of those who do not believe in the chastisement in the grave and who do not believe that before resurrection there is reward and punishment. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq says, 'By God we do not fear about you anything but Barzakh and when the affair will be in our hands on the last Day we will be mostly concerned with intercession for you'. Ibn Bābawayh (381 A.H.) and others report from al-Ṣādiq that when Saʿd b. Muʿādh al-Ansārī passed away ... the Prophet said that there is pressing over him ...; and in the Book of Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd there is a report from al-Ṣādiq that when Saʿd had been buried ... the Prophet said that there is no believer but that there is pressing over him in his grave[3].... Al-Kulaynī by a rightly proved chain reports that Yūnus, the Companion, asked al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, whether there was the chastisement of the grave for one who had been hanged? The Imām

1. S 23:100.
2. ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, Tafsīr, v.2, p.94.
3. The Sunnī traditionists also report Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh, the Companion, as saying that when Saʿd b. Muʿādh passed away the Prophet prayed over him the funeral prayer and when he was placed in his grave and the ground was levelled over him the Prophet glorified God and they also did so at great length. The Prophet then said, 'God is most Great', and they uttered the same. The Prophet then said, 'The grave had closed in on this upright servant, but after that God removed the pressure from him.' (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, op.cit., v.3, pp.360, 327). It shows that the believers are not exempted from the grave although their virtues and the supplications of the others may cause the pressure to be removed at the last.

> answered, 'God commands the wind to press over him'.... Ibn Bābawayh reports Ja'far al-Sādiq as transmitting from the Prophet that the graves press... over the believer as an expiation for his ungrateful attitude towards the blisses granted to him.[1]

These reports agree with the Sunnī doctrine and there is apparent contradiction with the other reports of al-Kulaynī, which we have already quoted,[1a] that the believers are in no way the subject of pressing in the grave. Al-Majlisī appreciates this apparent contradiction and says:

> The author (al-Majlisī himself) says that many trustworthy reports prove that the believers are not the subject of pressing in the grave as al-Kulaynī reports from Abū Başīr, but it is very difficult to harmonise between those reports.[2]

The eminent Shī'ī scholar Abū Manṣūr Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Ṭabarsī (of the sixth century A.H.) states a very clear procedure to solve such problems. He states that Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām was asked that if there were two reports from them and both would have been transmitted from them by trustworthy transmitters (what should be considered then)? The Imām answered:

> It will be seen which of them agrees with the verdict of the Book and the Sunnah and opposes the 'Ammah (the Sunnīs) and the decision will be taken in accordance with that.[3]

5. The relation between the soul and body in al-Barzakh.

The Sunnīs and the Shī'īs agree that there is questioning in the grave and after that phase of questioning the doors, either to Paradise or to hell, are opened and this state of comfort or torment is prolonged to the last Day but they differ as to whether the subject for this comfort or torment is only the soul or whether it extends to the body. The Sunnīs believe that soul and body both are subject to chastisement in the grave irrespective of whether it occurs with the return of the soul or whether there is only a contact between the soul and the body in this state.[4]

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.241. 1a. See, p. 258.
2. ibid, pp.242-3.
3. Al-Ṭabarsī, op.cit., v.2, p.107. It finds support in ibid, v.1, pp.8, 68.
4. Abū Ḥanīfah, the Sunnī Imām prefers keeping silent on this last issue. (Muṣliḥ al-Dīn, A Footnote on Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id (al-Nasafī), p.134).

The following quotations from eminent Sunni scholars elucidate this point. Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) states:

> Some of the Muʿtazilah and the Rāfidīs deny the punishment of the grave because a dead man is a solid body which is devoid of life and comprehension, so punishing him is impossible. The answer to this is that it is possible for God to create in all or some of the parts a kind of life such as would be able to comprehend the pain of punishment or the enjoyment of bliss. This does not require that the soul be restored to the body nor that it may move or be troubled or show any mark of punishment; for even the drowned man in water or the devoured in the bellies of beasts or the one who is hanged in the air is punished, although we do not see it.[1]

Ibn al-Qayyim (751 A.H.) attacks the Muʿtazilīs (and the Shīʿīs) as follows:

> They believe in the hereafter of the bodies but they say that it is not in barzakh but that it will happen when they will be raised from the graves; nevertheless they deny that the body is also tormented in barzakh.[2]

> Verily the opinion of the early community and its scholars is that when anyone expires he is either in comfort or in torment which afflicts his soul and his body.[3]

> There is agreement among the Sunnīs that the chastisement in the grave concerns both the soul and the body both. The soul is given comfort and torment separately and also together with the body.[4]

Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī (1035 A.H.) states:

> The first body is not unconcerned with the affairs of barzakh and it is not exempted from the chastisement of the grave nor from its comfort.[5]

1. Al-Taftāzānī, Sharḥ ʿAqāʾid al-Nasafī, p.134.
2. Ibn al-Qayyim, Kitāb al-Rūḥ, p.62.
3. ibid, p.63.
4. Ṣadr al-Dīn, Sharḥ ʿAqīdat al-Ṭaḥāwī, p.330.
5. Aḥmad Sirhindī, Maktūbāt, v.2, p.116.

ʿAlī al-Qārī (1014 A.H.) says:

> It should be known that the people of the truth agree that God, the Exalted, creates in the dead a sort of life in the grave, and that he feels the torment or comfort.[1]

Ibn ʿĀbidīn al-Shāmī (1253 A.H.) writes:

> It should not be rejected that the dead man is given chastisement in his grave as according to the generality life is given to him so that he feels the torment; and according to the Sunnīs it is not necessary that all the body should have been kept together; instead life is given to these divided parts and this sort of life cannot be recognised by the eyes.[2]

Qāḍī Thanā-Allāh of Panipat (1225 A.H.) corroborates these statements as follows:

> It is right that the abodes, in Paradise or in hell, are shown to mankind which is a combination of body and soul.[3]

As regards the nature of life in <u>barzakh</u> there are two opinions among the Sunnīs. First is that the soul rests in <u>ʿIlliyīn</u> or in <u>Sijjīn</u>, the two abodes of the virtuous and the wicked souls; and there is established a contact between the soul and the dead body. Second is that the soul is restored to the dead body but is not recognised by the worldly eyes; and the body is not dominating the soul as it is in this world but the soul dominates the body. The dialecticians favour the first opinion whereas the traditionists generally favour the second view. We have already given[4] the comments of al-Taftāzānī who does not assert that the soul is restored to the body. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Firhārwī (after 1239 A.H.), the traditionist and scholastic theologian, attacks al-Taftāzānī in his commentary upon al-Taftāzānī's commentary upon the creed of al-Nasafī (537 A.H.). He says:

> There is my objection to this answer (the answer of al-Taftāzānī to the Muʿtazilīs that the restoration of the soul is not necessary for the establishment of life in the grave and that it could be had

1. ʿAlī al-Qārī, <u>op.cit</u>., p.121.
2. Ibn ʿĀbidīn, <u>Radd al-Muḥtār</u>, v.3, p.180.
3. Qāḍī Thanā Allāh, <u>Tafsīr</u>, v.10, p.225.
4. See, p.263.

> by the soul's contact with the body) that the truly proved traditions[1] declare that at the time of questioning the soul is restored to the body. So the answer by the denial of the soul's restoration is not justified.[2]

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Al-Bukhārī has laid down four Chapter-headings in this context. He reports that at the time of questioning the angels make the dead man sit and ask him the questions. The hypocrites and the unbelievers who fail to give right answers are then tormented. Anas b. Mālik, the Companion, reports the Prophet as saying:

> He will then be given a blow with hammers of iron and will utter a shout which will be heard by all who are near to him, with the exception of men and *jinn*.[3]

This suggests that the chastisement in the grave is extended to the body and that the body is firstly given a sort of life which makes it feel the punishment therein. Al-Bukhārī does not report that the soul is restored to the body but he believes that there is life in the grave and the dead man is made to sit and then questioned. He has already given the report of al-Barrā' the Companion, which states that the believer is also made to sit in the grave. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (241 A.H.), the teacher of al-Bukhārī, reports this tradition of al-Barrā' (72 A.H.) more explicitly, and it is given there that the soul is restored to the body. Al-Barrā' reports the Prophet as saying:

> Seek protection of God from the chastisement in the grave.... Verily when the believing servant bids farewell to this world and turns towards *al-Ākhirah* the angels, with white faces, come to him...; then his soul is restored to his body (in the grave) and the two angels come to him and make him sit and ask him (questions).... Verily when the unbeliever leaves this world and turns towards *al-Ākhirah*, the angels with dark faces come to him...; then his soul is restored to his body (in the grave) and the two angels come, make him sit and ask him who his Lord is, to

1. See, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *op.cit.*, v.4, pp.287-8, Ibn Taymīyah, *Sharḥ ḥadīth al-Nuzūl*, p.88.
2. Al-Firhārwī, *op.cit.*, p.322.
3. Al-Bukhārī, *op.cit.*, v.2, p.123.

> which he replies, 'Alas, I do not know.' They ask him what his religion is, and he replies, 'Alas, alas, I do not know.' They ask him about that man who was sent on a mission among his people, and he replies, 'Alas, alas, I do not know.' Then a crier calls from heaven, 'He has lied, so spread a bed for him from hell, clothe him from hell, and open a door for him into hell.' Then some of its heat and pestilential wind come to him, and his grave becomes restricted so that his ribs are pressed together. One who is blind and dumb is then placed in charge of him, having a sledgehammer such that if a mountain were struck with it it would become dust. He gives him a blow with it and he (the dead man) utters a shout which is heard by everything between the East and the West, with the exception of men and jinn; and he becomes dust. Then his soul is (again) restored to him.[1]

This report bears ample evidence that according to the Sunnī traditionists the soul is restored to the deceased in barzakh and that the chastisement in the grave is concerned with the body as well as with the soul. Abū Hurayrah, the Companion, reports from the Prophet that when the hypocrite fails to answer the questions which are put to him in the grave the earth is told to press in upon him and it does so. The Prophet, then, says:

> His ribs are pressed together and remain there suffering punishment till God resurrects him from that place of his burial.[2]

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī.

We have already given[2a] quotations from al-Kulaynī that the questioning in the grave and the chastisement therein are truly proved. As regards the restoration of the soul to the body al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām as transmitting the following tradition of the Prophet:

> When the dead man is placed in his grave the soul is restored to his body and the two angels of the grave come to him and interrogate him.[3]

1. Aḥmad, op.cit., v.4, p.288.
2. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.1, p.99. 2a. See, p.258-60.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.234.

Al-Kulaynī reports that when al-Bāqir, the Imām, transmitted this tradition, he wept. He further reports Ja'far al-Ṣādiq as saying:

> So when the dead man is placed in his grave the soul is restored to him to his thighs; then he is asked about what he knows.[1]
>
> Verily when the (dead) believer is brought out from his house he is accompanied by crowds of angels up to his grave.... Then there enter upon him in his grave the two angels of the grave and they are Munkar and Nakīr, the two companions of the grave. They implant into him his soul (from his head) to his thighs and ask him questions.... And if the deceased is an unbeliever the angels accompany him up to his grave cursing him.... The grave presses over him so that his ribs meet together.... The two angels of the grave make him sit and implant into him his soul up to his thighs and ask him questions.... Then a crier calls from heaven, He has lied, so spread in his grave a bed for him from hell, clothe him from hell and open a door for him into hell.[2]

The Shī'īs believe in the chastisement in the grave and that the soul is restored to the body therein but according to them the time for the chastisement in the grave is only one day and one hour. Zurārah asked al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, why palm branches are placed with the dead? The Imām answered:

> So long as it is fresh, the chastisement and the trial (in the grave) is removed from them; and all the chastisement is only one day and one hour from the burial place of the dead in the grave and the turning back of the people; and they place these palm-branches so that there may be no chastisement during this time (so long as these are fresh). When by God's pleasure it does not occur within this time it will not occur after the branches are dried.[3]

Al-Majlisī says that the chain of this tradition is ḥasan almost to the power of being ṣaḥīḥ. He then comments as follows:

> There are two interpretations of this tradition. The first is that the chastisement the original

1. ibid, v.3, p.130.
2. ibid, v.3, p.239-40.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit, p.243.

> body is only in the early period and the second is that the chastisement begins in the first hour and if God confers favour(upon him) and does not punish (any one) in that time, He the Exalted, by His pleasure will not punish (him) after the palm-branches are dried; and this second interpretation is more clear.[1]

This suggests that after this first phase of the questioning and the chastisement in the grave the body which is placed in the grave is merely dead and that there is no chastisement after that. We have already given[2] al-Taftāzānī's comments that the Shī'īs regard the dead body as being merely an inorganic matter and that they do not believe in the chastisement in the grave. Al-Taftāzānī is justified if he meant the later phase of the deceased in his grave. If this is so this means that the Shī'īs do agree with the Sunnīs in the doctrines of the questioning in the grave, the restoration of the soul into the body, the pressing of the grave over the body and the chastisement therein, although there are different opinions in regard to the duration of that.

It is true that most of the affairs of barzakh are more related to the soul than to the body, but the Shī'īs lay more stress upon the soul than do the Sunnīs, and they believe that after the first phase of barzakh almost all its aspects relate only to the soul. Al-Majlisī says:

> The questioning (in the grave) and the pressing of the grave relate to this body and all other affairs of barzakh relate to the soul.[3]

6. The abode of the soul in al-Barzakh.

It is agreed that the soul is in contact with the body which is placed in the grave but there are various opinions in respect of the abode of the souls. It is also agreed that the abode

1. ibid, p.243.
2. See, p.263.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.233.

of the virtuous souls is ʿIllīyīn,[1] the highest places, and the prison of the wicked souls is Sijjīn where they are in a state of punishment in addition to the chastisement in the graves where the souls have a contact with the dead bodies.

The souls of high-ranking, virtuous men have different categories in regard to their abode in barzakh.

1. The souls of the Prophets rest in their original bodies and their graves are given the status of Paradise and related with ʿillīyīn, the highest places. This state of their life in the graves is generally kept hidden from the physical eye of this world but it is not kept away from the ʿillīyīn, the highest places. All the Sunnīs agree to this and believe that the Prophets are given entry into Paradise during their barzakh and that they enter Paradise just after their death.

2. The souls of the Martyrs are kept in the crops of green birds which openly fly in Paradise. It is their barzakh and when there comes the last Day these will join their original bodies and resurrection will take place. During their stay in the bodies of these green birds the contact of souls with these bodies is not the contact of growth and development but the contact of a diamond with a box.
There is another explanation of this, namely that the souls themselves are given the forms of green birds and these souls fly in Paradise, and on resurrection these will come back to their original bodies. It is true that their life in barzakh is life in Paradise but it is in an interim form of life and not life in their original bodies.

1. The Qurʾān mentions the places where there are the records of the actions as ʿIllīyīn (the highest places) and Sijjīn (prison). See, S 83:7, 18. Ibn Kathīr (774 A.H.) reports that Kaʿb told ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās that Sijjīn is the seventh earth where the souls of the unbelievers dwell; and ʿIllīyīn is the seventh heaven where the souls of the believers dwell. (Tafsīr, v.4, p.486). The Shīʿī commentator Abū ʿAlī al-Faḍl al-Ṭabarsī (of the sixth century A.H.) also reports that Sijjīn is in the lowest seventh earth where dwell the souls of the wicked and Illīyīn is in the Seventh heaven where are the souls of the believers. (See, Majmaʿ al-Bayān, v.10, pp.453, 455). Qāḍī Thanāʾ Allāh of Panipat reports a tradition that the souls of the believers are in the seventh heaven and they see there their abodes in Paradise. (op. cit., v.10, p.224).

> 3. The souls of the other virtuous men also have their abode in ʿillīyīn, but we have not found any report as giving the explicit form of their dwelling there; and we have already expressed that these also have a contact with their bodies which are in their graves.

i. The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Al-Bukhārī holds that on the expiry of their life in this world the Prophets enter Paradise and that their barzakh is not apart from Paradise. The Prophet saw in a vision three abodes in Paradise, the abode of the generality of the believers, the abode of the martyrs and his own abode (among the abodes of the Prophets) in Paradise. The Prophet asked Jibrīl and Mīkāʾīl, the angels, to let him enter his dwelling but they told him as follows:

> Verily there remains a part of your life which you have not completed as yet. If you had completed that you would have entered your abode.[1]

It shows that the Prophets, just after their death, enter their dwelling in Paradise. Al-Bukhārī further reports that the grave of the Prophet is not apart from Paradise but forms a part of it. Al-Bukhārī lays down a Chapter-heading as follows:

> Excellence of the space between (his) grave and the pulpit.

He then reports ʿAbd Allah b. Zayd al-Māzinī, the Companion (63 A.H.) as transmitting from the Prophet:

> The space between my house (where the Prophet was buried afterwards) and my pulpit is one of the gardens of Paradise.[2]

Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), adds in his report from the Prophet as follows:

> And my pulpit is upon my Water-Tank.[3]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.2, p.127; v.9, p.57.
2. ibid, v.2, p.77.
3. ibid, v.2, p.77.

As regards the life of the other Prophets in their graves al-Bukhārī does not report anything, but Muslim reports the Prophet as saying:

> On the night of my ascension I passed by a red heap (of rocks) and I saw that Mūsā was offering prayer in his grave.[1]

Abū Yaʿlā the traditionist (227 A.H.) reports Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet as follows:

> The Prophets are alive in their graves and they offer prayers.[2]

It indicates that the graves of the Prophets are not apart from Paradise although the modes of their life therein are not observed by the physical eyes of this world.

Al-Bukhārī reports that when Ḥārithah b. Surāqah was killed at the battle of Badr his mother asked the Prophet if her son was in Paradise? The Prophet told her:

> O Mother of Ḥārithah! In Paradise there are various gardens (apartments) and verily your son has entered Al-Firdaus, the highest.[3]

One may ask in which form the martyrs enter Paradise during this phase of barzakh. Al-Bukhārī is silent on this issue but Muslim reports that Masrūq, the Successor (63 A.H.), asked ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion, with reference to the following verse of the Qurʾān:

> Do not consider those who have been killed in God's path to be dead; nay, they are alive in the presence of their Lord and are provided with sustenance.[4]

He replied that he had asked (the Prophet) about that and he had answered as follows:

> Their spirits are in the crop of green birds which are like lamp arches swinging from Al-ʿArsh (The Throne), which go where they wish

1. Muslim, op.cit., v.7, p.102, al-Nasāʾī, Al-Sunan, v.1, p.185.
2. Al-Suyūṭī, Al-Jāmʿ al-Ṣaghīr, p.103.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.24.
4. S 3:168.

> in Paradise and they return to those lamp-arches. Their Lord looks down on them and asks whether they desire anything, and they ask in reply what they could wish when they can go where they like in Paradise. He asks them that three times and when they see that they will not be left alone without being asked something, they tell their Lord that they wish Him to return their souls to their bodies so that they may be killed in His path once again. Then when He sees that they lack nothing they are left without further questioning.[1]

This report says that the souls of martyrs rest in the crops of green birds. The report of Mālik, the Imām, tells us that these souls themselves are in the form of birds and there is no idea of the souls' entry to some other bodies. Mālik (179 A.H.) reports Kaʿb b. Mālik, the Companion (50 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> The spirit of the believer is in the form of a bird which is swinging by a tree of Paradise till God restores that to its body when He is to raise them at the resurrection.[2]

These reports suggest that during this phase of barzakh the souls of the Martyrs do not dwell in their original bodies but they have some intermediate form of dwelling; and in this form they enter Paradise; or else this is not a statement of their actual form but a statement of their actions when it is said that they fly like birds. During this time they are in barzakh as well as in Paradise.

ii. The approach of al-Kulaynī.

The Shīʿīs believe that the souls dwell in some spiritual bodies which resemble their original physical bodies. Al-Majlisī names that body as Jasad mithālī.[3] According to them the Paradise and hell of this phase of barzakh are separate from the Paradise and hell, which are the abodes at the end of the last judgement.

1. Muslim, op.cit., v.2, pp.135-6.
2. Mālik, Al-Muʾwattā, v.1, p.186. (with al-Suyūtī's Tanwīr al-Ḥawālik), Al-Nasāʾī, op.cit., v.1, p.292.
3. It means 'a spiritual body in the likeness of this material body'.

ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (307 A.H.) explains the following verse of the Qurʾān:

> They shall have their sustenance therein morning and evening.[1]

Al-Qummī then comments:

> It is provided for them in this world's Paradise before the Last Day. The argument is that there is the Word of God 'morning and evening' and that there will be no morning and evening in the hereafter in the Everlasting Paradise. This morning and evening is in this world's Paradise where the souls of the believers settle and the sun and moon rise.[2]

He comments further on the following verse of the Qurʾān:

> So as to those who shall be wretched they shall be in the fire; for them shall be sighing and groaning in it, abiding therein so long as the heavens and the earth endure except as your Lord please; surely your Lord is the Mighty doer of what He intends.[3]

Al-Qummī then comments upon this verse as follows:

> It is in this world's fire before the Last Day.... Those who are made happy shall be in Paradise and they will dwell there in the Paradise of this world where the souls of the believers are taken so long as the heaven and the earth endure except as your Lord pleases: a gift which shall never be cut off. It is a favour, which will not be interrupted, from among the favours of the hereafter and it will be given to them.[4]

The argument implies that in the hereafter the heavens and the earth will change and perish; so it applies to this world's Paradise and hell.

Al-Kulaynī lays down a Chapter-heading, 'In regard to the souls of the believers', and reports that Ḥabbāt al-ʿUranī, accompanied by the Commander of the Faithful (ʿAlī) went to the outskirts of Al-Kūfah and ʿAlī kept standing there, at the valley of Al-Salām, for a long time as if he was addressing the nations. On being asked ʿAlī stated as follows:

1. S 19:62.
2. Al-Qummī, op.cit., v.2, p.52.
3. S 11:106.
4. Al-Qummī, op.cit., v.1, p.338.

> O Ḥabbah! This is a word to a believer or an intimation with him. If it is unveiled to you, you would have seen them using sheets as a support when sitting on their heels, in various circles, talking to each other.

Ḥabbah asked the Imām whether they were bodies or souls? The Imām then answered:

> They are souls. No believer expires in any of the patches of the earth but there is the command to his soul, 'Join the valley of Al-Salām'; and it is indeed a patch from ʿAdan's Paradise.[1]

A Companion told Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, that his brother was in Baghdād and he was afraid of his brother's death in Baghdād. The Imām told him:

> Do not fear wherever he dies. There is no believer, neither in the East nor in the West of the earth but God collects his soul in the valley of Al-Salām.

On being asked where the valley of Al-Salām is, the Imām answered:

> It is on the outskirts of Al-Kūfah. I see that there are the circles of the believers where they are sitting, talking to each other.[2]

The Imām further states:

> Verily the souls are in forms which resemble the (original) bodies and these are in a garden of Paradise. They recognise each other and question each other. Whenever a soul joins the souls these say, 'Leave him for he has glided away from a dreadful affair.' These after some time ask him questions.[3]

Al-Kulaynī further reports that Yūnus b. Zubyān told Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, that the people (the Sunnīs) say that the souls of the believers are in the crops of green birds in lamp-arches beneath Al-ʿArsh (The Throne). The Imām answered:

> Glory to God, O Yūnus! The believer is more respected before God than that He may place his soul in the crop of a bird. When it is the death-time of a believer, the Prophet, ʿAlī, Fāṭimah,

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.243.
2. ibid, v.3, p.243.
3. ibid, v.3, p.244.

> al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn and the angels who are near to him come to him. When God, the Mighty and the Glorified, causes him death He turns his soul into a body which is similar to his body in this world. These souls then eat and drink. Whenever a newcomer comes to them they recognise him by the complexion of his face which he had in this world.[1]

Al-Kulaynī attacks here the Sunnī traditionists who transmit that the souls of the believers are in the crops of green birds; but he agrees with the explanation of Mālik that the souls themselves could be in the forms of the birds. He does not insist that the souls are necessarily in forms which are similar to their original bodies, but these could be in the forms of birds so long as they are recognised.

Al-Kulaynī reports Isḥāq as asking Mūsā Kāẓim, the Seventh Imām, whether the soul of a believer visits his people in this world. The Imām affirmed it. Isḥāq asked him how many times. The Imām answered:

> According to their ranks these visit their people. Some souls visit once in two days and certain souls once in three days. The lowest rank of them visit their people weekly.

Isḥāq then asked the Imām in which hour these visit them. He answered that it is when the sun has passed down. The Imām was further asked in which form the soul visits its people. The Imām replied:

> In the form of a sparrow or any bird smaller than that they visit their people. Then God, the Exalted, sends an angel for him who makes him behold what he likes and conceals from him what he dislikes.

This report harmonises with the Sunnī approach on this issue wherever the former report of al-Kulaynī rejects the Sunnī opinion. The general procedure[3] of the Shīʿī traditionists, on such occasions, is to accept the variant report and interpret the harmonising report as having been uttered on the

1. ibid, v.3, p.245.
2. ibid, v.3, p.231.
3. See, Al-Ṭabarsī, op.cit., v.1, pp.8, 68; v.2, p.107.

basis of taqīyah, pious dissimulation, but hereby they argue with the approach of Mālik in principle. Al-Majlisī says:

> The physical pleasures according to the different states of the men of Paradise have different categories. There are the souls which like cattle graze in the garden of Paradise and avail themselves of its blisses like animals as if they had been enjoying pleasure in this world without having any share in proximity, conjunction, love and excellence. There are some who aspire for Paradise as it is the place of God's regard and an abode of His friends....[1]

As regards the souls of the unbelievers al-Kulaynī reports ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, as saying:

> 'The worst well on the earth is barhūt in which there dwell the souls of the unbelievers and it is in the Haḍramaut where the unbelievers are in bodies which are unseen.'[2]

Al-Kulaynī further reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> 'God created a fire in the East for the dwelling of the souls of the unbelievers and these eat its tree of zaqqūm and these drink its hot water all night long. When it dawns they move to a valley on their right which is known as barhūt whose heat is more severe than the world's fires. These meet each other and recognise each other and when it is evening they return to the fire; and they remain in this process up to the last Day.[3]

This suggests that there is a hell after death for the unbelievers before the hell for them in the hereafter. They are in this chastisement of the barzakh. As regards their last abode in the hereafter it is also shown to them, every morning and evening, for which they are still more in fear and discomfiture. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, says:

> They are being punished in the fire and they supplicate, 'O God! do not cause the last hour to be established, do not fulfil your words (of establishing the greater chastisement) which you made for us and do not cause our next children to join their ancestors among us.[4]

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.224.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.246.
3. ibid, v.3, p.247.
4. ibid, v.3, p.245.

The Shīʿīs admit that chastisement in the interim period between death and the Last Hour is a verity but their distinctive belief is that a Paradise and a hell of this intermediate state are in this world, in ʿAdan and in Ḥaḍramawt where the souls of the believers and the unbelievers dwell respectively. This begins at the end of the questioning in the grave where the souls are restored to the bodies for a short while and all the next affairs of barzakh relate to the souls only.

7. The augmentation of the deceased's good deeds in al-barzakh.

At death all the actions of the deceased reach an end and he enters the state of barzakh. During this state the prayers of the men of this world can benefit him and living men can transmit their virtues and good deeds to make the deceased rewarded for these.

i. The Sunni evidence.

Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī states the Sunnī doctrine as follows:

> The minor barzakh has one aspect of this world's aspects namely that there can be augmentation; and the affairs of that state of barzakh are different in regard to the men of different ranks.[1]

Al-Bukhārī quotes ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.) as reporting that the mother of Saʿd b. ʿUbādah died and Saʿd was not present . On coming he asked the Prophet:

> Verily my mother has passed away and I was not present at that time. Does she benefit if I give charity on her behalf?

The Prophet answered in the affirmative. Saʿd then said:

> I call upon you to bear witness that I have given this garden of mine, al-Mikhrāf, in charity.[2]

Al-Nasāʾī (303 A.H.) reports that Saʿd asked the Prophet which form of charity was the best. The Prophet said it was to satisfy (the thirsty) with water.[3] Abū Dāʾūd (275 A.H.)

1. Aḥmad Sirhindī, op.cit., v.2, p.16 No.29.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.9.
3. Al-Nasaʾī, op.cit., v.2, p.133.

transmits that Saʿd dug a well and said that it was for Umm Saʿd.[1]

Al-Dārimī (255 A.H.) transmits on the authority of ʿUqbah b. ʿĀmir (58 A.H.) that the Prophet said:

> Everyone who dies will have fully completed his actions except one who is on the frontier during the holy war, for his deed will be made to go on increasing for him till the day of resurrection;[2] (and he will be safe from the trial in the grave).[3]

These reports indicate that augmentation takes place in different ways.

ii. The Shīʿī evidence.

The Shīʿī traditionist Ibn Bābawayh (381 A.H.) reports that the Prophet said:

> ʿĪsā passed by a grave where one deceased was being punished. He passed by the same grave in the following year. He saw that there was no chastisement therein. He asked God why it was that he had passed by that grave the previous year and the deceased was being punished therein but he passed by that grave in the following year and there was no chastisement therein. God revealed to him:
>
> > 'O Spirit of God! His virtuous son grew up, chose the right path, patronised an orphan and looked after him. I forgave him by reason of the deeds of his son.'[4]

Ibn Bābawayh further reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> At the death of a man no reward keeps following him but three actions: (first) any virtuous deed he performed in his life which remains established after his death; (secondly) any good procedure which he adopted which was carried on after his death; and (thirdly) that there is a virtuous son (of his) who prays for his father's forgiveness in the hereafter.[5]

1. Al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.149.
2. Al-Dārimī, v.2, p.211. Al-Tirmidhī reports the same tradition from the Prophet on the authority of Faḍālah b. ʿUbayd the Companion. (See, al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.332).
3. See, ibid, p.332.
4. Al-Ṣuddūq, Amālī, p.460.
5. ibid, p.31.

All these reports bear witness that there is provision for augmentation of the deceased's good deeds in barzakh, either on the basis of his own actions or by the prayers of those who are living in this world.

8. The Resurrection.

i. The mode of resurrection.

Abū Manṣūr al-Baghdādī (429 A.H.) states the Sunnī doctrine as follows:

> Our scholars say that the reason allows the soul to return into the body and the report establishes it as incumbent.[1]

Al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) and al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) state this doctrine as follows:

> The quickening of the dead is a verity. God will quicken the dead from their graves by gathering their original parts and restoring their souls to their bodies. There is God's statement: 'Then on the Day of Resurrection you will be quickened;'[2] and 'Say, "He who formed them at first will revive them"';[3] and there are many other decisive statutes which speak of the Resurrection of the bodies.[4]

Mullā Ḥusayn b. Iskandar al-Ḥanafī, the commentator of Al-Waṣīyah, the work of Abū Ḥanīfah, the Imām, writes as follows:

> Abū Ḥanīfah says, 'We admit that God will revive these bodies after death and will raise them for benefits and rewards and the execution of rights on a day the duration of which will be fifty thousand years.' All the Muslims agree that God will revive these bodies after death and will raise the dead from the graves; from the bellies of the beasts and the crops of the birds; that He will unite all their original particles after they have perished and restore their souls to them. This is the revival; and then He will drive them to the field and this is the resurrection.[5]

1. Abū Manṣūr al-Baghdādī al-Tamīmī, op.cit., p.237.
2. S 23:16.
3. S 36:79.
4. Al-Taftāzānī, op.cit., pp.134-5.
5. Mullā Ḥusayn b. Iskandar, Al-Jawharat al-Munīfah, p.28.

Al-Majlisī states the Shī'ī agreement with this doctrine as follows:

> Ma'ād Jismānī (Resurrection) means that on the Last Day these bodies will be revived and again the souls will come into contact with them. If they are men of Faith and felicity, they will enter corporal Paradise and if they are men of unbelief and villainy they will enter hell and will be put under corporal chastisement; and this is one of the essentials of the Faith of Islām, rather it is agreed upon by all the Faiths. The Jews and the Christians also agree to it and most of the scriptures give their verdict on its verity, particularly the Qur'ān; most of the verses are very clear on this point and no other interpretations can be given to them.... There is no doubt that rejection of the corporal resurrection is unbelief and it amounts to rejection of the Qur'ān, the Glorious; the Prophet and the rightful Imāms. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (606 A.H.) gives judgement that it is impossible to combine the faith in the teachings of the Prophet and rejection of the bodily resurrection.[1]

(a) The Qur'ānic evidence.

The Qur'ān says:

> Does not man see that We have created him from the sperm? Then behold! he is an open disputant. And he makes comparisons for Us and forgets his own creation. He says: 'Who will give life to the bones when they are decomposed'? Say, 'He will give life to them Who brought them into existence at first, and He is Cognizant of all creation.[2]

The Qur'ān refers to the objection of the unbelievers as follows:

> 'What! When we are dead and have become dust? That is a far (from probable) return'. We know what the earth diminishes of them and with Us is a writing that preserves.[3]

The Qur'ān answers this general objection of theirs as follows:

> Surely We give life and cause to die, and to Us is the eventual coming; The Day on which the earth shall cleave asunder under them, they will make haste; that will be a gathering together quite easy to Us.[4]

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.221. It is further emphasised on p.329.
2. S 36:77-9.
3. S 50:3-4.
4. S 50:43-4.

> And they say: 'What! when we shall have become bones and decayed particles, shall we then certainly be raised up, being a new creation? Say, 'Become stones or iron, or some other creature which is too hard (to receive life) in your minds.' But they will say: 'Who will restore us?' Say, 'He Who created you at first.'[1]

> Do they not consider that God Who created the heaven and the earth is able to create their like? And He has appointed for them a term about which there is no doubt.[2]

Those who deny a life after death are told here, in these verses, that life after death must follow even if they have completely changed, split in particles in their graves, or turned into stones. The One who created them at first can easily resurrect them.

(b) Al-Bukhārī's evidence:

Al-Bukhārī lays down a Chapter-heading: 'The state of resurrection'[3] and reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās, the Companion (68 A.H.) as transmitting one of the Prophet's sermons:

> Verily, at the resurrection, you will be assembled barefoot and naked; (he then recited) 'As We originated the first creation so shall We restore it; a promise binding on Us. We shall surely do so.'[4] Verily the first to be clothed on the day of resurrection will be Ibrāhīm.[5]

This report suggests that there will be corporal resurrection and the dust particles or fragments of the deceased bodies, whatever the position might be, will surely be restored. Al-Bukhārī further reports the Prophet as saying:

> Mankind will be assembled in three classes: Those who desire Paradise and those who fear hell coming two, three, four and ten (in numbers) on camels; and the rest will be assembled, hell being with them where they are at mid-day and where they spend the night, where they are in the morning and where they are in the evening.[6]

1. S 17:49-51. 2. S 17:99.
3. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.135.
4. S 21:104.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.136.
6. ibid, v.8, p.135.

Al-Tirmidhī reports this more explicitly:

> Mankind will be assembled on the day of resurrection in three classes, one walking, one riding, and one on their faces.[1]

The third category in this tradition is the same as the one given in al-Bukhārī's report regarding those who will be driven by hell. Al-Bukhārī further reports Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), as stating that a man asked the Prophet how the unbeliever would be assembled on his face? The Prophet answered:

> He who caused him to walk on his feet in this world has power to make him walk on his face on the Last Day.[2]

It is not necessary that the deceased should be restored exactly in the same position and the same age in which they would have passed away but the reports indicate that bodies will be comprised of their original particles (with which they were born) but in changed [illegible] forms and ages. Al-Bukhārī reports that all of them would be raised as uncircumcised.[3] Al-Tirmidhī reports the Prophet as saying:

> The people of Paradise will enter Paradise short-haired, beardless, with their eyes anointed with collyrium, aged thirty or thirty-three years.[4]

Similarly it is reported that Āzar will be turned into the form of a hyena[5] and then he will be taken into hell. These reports tell that the forms and states can be different but there is no rejection of the basic doctrine that the original particles of the body will necessarily be restored.

(c) <u>Al-Kulaynī's evidence</u>:

On the authority of al-Kulaynī al-Majlisī reports that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, was asked whether the deceased's body would be consumed? The Imām answered as follows:

1. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.68.
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.136.
3. ibid, v.8, p.136.
4. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.89.
5. See, al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.169.

> Why not? Nothing remains of the flesh nor of the bones but the dust particles from which it was originated; and these never perish in the surrounding grave so that the body might be raised from there as it was originated in its first creation.[1]

Al-Kulaynī further reports ʿAlī, the First Imām, as saying:

> When it [illegible] the Last Day God, the Blessed and the Exalted, will raise the people from their graves, naked and bare, (barefoot), short-haired and beardless, in one field. The Light of Belief will cause them to walk and the darkness (of unbelief) will debar them, so that they will assemble at the acclivity of the Field of Resurrection.[2]

The Shīʿīs and the Sunnīs agree that the bodies will be raised and the souls will be restored to them and that there will be resurrection of all the people as they are living in this world. But al-Ghazālī (505 A.H.) and Rāghib al-Isfahānī (502 A.H.) from among the Sunnīs and Shaykh Mufīd (413 A.H.) and Shaykh Bahāʾ al-Dīn from among the Shīʿīs hold that the soul is incorporeal and never unites with the body; but being apart from the body, the soul affects the body and keeps it alive. Al-Majlisī, on the authority of Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt, reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> The soul does not unite with the body nor does it enter the body. Instead it is like the glass of a lamp which surrounds the body.[3]

Al-Majlisī does not accept such traditions as being true and says:

> I have no intimation of any 'rightly traced back' and 'clearly stated' tradition in this context. It is true that in some of the rare reports there is an indication and pointer to this issue but on the basis of this the opinion of establishing the soul as incorporeal cannot be formed.[4]

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.229.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.104.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.226.
4. ibid, p.227.

ii. The time of the Hour of resurrection.

On the Last Day there will be the complete destruction of the Universe and on the same day the dead will be raised and resurrected to face the last judgement. The Qur'ān names that day as Yawm ʿAẓīm, Yawm al-Baʿth, Yawm al-Khurūj, Yawm al-Jamʿ, and Yawm al-Dīn. The Qur'ān says:

> Do not these think that they shall be raised again, for Yawm ʿAẓīm (a mighty day).[1]

> And at the time when the Hour shall come the guilty shall swear that they did not tarry but an hour... so this is Yawm al-Baʿth (the day of resurrection).[2]

> The day when they shall hear the cry in truth; that is Yawm al-Khurūj (the day of coming forth).[3]

> On the day that He will gather you for Yawm al-Jamʿ (the day of gathering), that is the day of the manifestations of defects.[4]

> Again, what will make you realise what Yawm al-Dīn (the day of judgement) is? The Day on which no soul shall control anything for another soul and the command over that will be with God.[5]

Al-Bukhārī places the first of the above-quoted verses as his Chapter-heading and reports the Prophet as saying:

> The day on which men shall stand before the Lord of the worlds[6] one of them shall stand in his sweat reaching his ears.[7]

As regards the virtuous believer al-Bayhaqī reports Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.) as asking the Prophet who would be strong enough to stand on the day of resurrection? Abū Saʿīd referred to the verse given in this report of al-Bukhārī and the Prophet answered as follows:

> It will be made easy for the believer, so that it will be for him as easy as the prayer.[8]

1. S 83: 4-5.
2. S 30:55-6.
3. S 50:42.
4. S 64:9.
5. S 82:19.
6. S 83:6.
7. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., V.8, p.138.
8. Al-Tabrīzī, op.cit., p.487.

Al-Kulaynī reports ʿAlī, the First Imām, as saying:

> Men's stay in this world is very short and they will soon be raised in the hereafter.[1]

As regards the point of time it is with the secret Knowledge of God. The Qurʾān says:

> They ask you about the Hour, whither is its destination?... To your Lord belongs its goal.[2]

> They ask you about the Hour when will it take place? Say the knowledge of it is only with my Lord; none but He shall manifest it at its time; it will be momentous in the heavens and the earth; it will not come on you but of a sudden. They ask you as if you were solicitous about it. Say its knowledge is only with God, but most people do not know.[3]

> Verily the Hour is coming. I wish to conceal it so that every one may be requited as he strives.[4]

Al-Bukhārī reports that the Prophet was asked when it would be the Last Hour? The Prophet replied:

> The one who is asked about it is no better informed than the one who is asking.[5]

iii. The place of the resurrection.

The Last Hour will shake the whole of the world and amount to complete destruction of the Universe. So it is difficult to particularise any part of this earth as the place of resurrection. The Qurʾān says:

> On the day when the earth shall be changed into a different earth and the heavens as well.[6]

> And the whole earth shall be in His grip on the day of resurrection and the heavens rolled up in His Right Hand; glory be to Him and may He be exalted above what they associate (with Him).[7]

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.171.
2. S 79:42-4.
3. S 7:187.
4. S 20:15.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.1, p.
6. S 14:48.
7. S 39:67.

(a) Al-Bukhārī's evidence:

Sahl b. Sa'd, the Companion (91 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> On the day of resurrection mankind will be assembled on a white plain with a reddish tinge like a loaf of white bread.[1]

Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> On the day of resurrection the earth will be one piece of bread which the Almighty will turn in His Hand, as one of you turns his loaf while travelling....[2]

These reports bear evidence that on the complete destruction of the whole of the Universe there will be a new phase of this world where mankind will be assembling to face the last judgement.

(b) Al-Kulaynī's evidence:

Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> The earth shall be changed into a bread and they will eat from it so that God, the Mighty and the Glorified may relieve them from reckoning.[3]

'Alī names the place where they will be going after death as Dār al-thawāb (the abode of reward), Dār al-'Iqāb (the abode of punishment); Dār al-Jazā' (the place for compensation) and Dār al-ḥisāb (the place of reckoning).[4] This report resurrection will occur at the same place which will then transfer them to Paradise and hell, where the virtuous will be rewarded and the wicked will be punished.

9. The taking away of one's good or bad deeds in the hereafter.

The Sunnīs and Shī'īs agree that in the hereafter there

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.135.
2. ibid, v.8, p.135.
3. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.121.
4. ibid, v.8, p.182.

could be a taking away of one's good or bad deeds to help some others but they differ in regard to the basis of this transmission of deeds. The Sunnīs mostly establish it as a matter of retaliation whereas the Shīʿīs suggest the faithful ones to be the rightful heirs of the good deeds of those who are not faithful to the Divine Imāms. This would occur on the basis of dust or clay from which they had been created and their good or bad deeds will be regarded as having occurred because of their previous contact with the dust particles of the others before their birth. In spite of this basic doctrine they do not reject the retaliation in principle[1] although they believe it to be limited to a certain extent.

i. Al-Bukhārī's approach in regard to retalitation in the hereafter.

Al-Bukhārī lays down a Chapter-heading in this context as follows:

> 'Retaliation on the day of resurrection; and it will surely occur for on that day there will be reward for the deeds and severe calamities ....'

Al-Bukhārī, then, reports the Prophet as saying:

> He who has done a wrong affecting his brother must ask his forgiveness for it before that his good deeds may be taken from him for his brother, for there will be no <u>dīnār</u> and no <u>dirham</u> on that day (of resurrection). If he would not have done good deeds it will be taken from his brother's evil deeds and these will be laid upon him.[2]

1. Al-Kulaynī reports on the authority of ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, the Fourth Imām, that ʿAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, said that God would say on the Day of resurrection: 'I am God; there is no God but I; I am the King, I am the Judge; I do not oppress and I shall decide between you in accordance with justice. I shall take the right of the weak from the strong one; and I shall recompense the wrong done by the people with their good and bad deeds; and who forgive the wrong done to them, shall be rewarded.' (Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.261.)
2. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.138.

Al-Bukhārī further reports Abū Sa'id al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> The believers will escape the hell and then they will be stopped on a bridge between Paradise and hell; then for some of them retaliation will be caused for some wrong which had occurred among them in this world.[1]

Muslim reports that the Prophet asked his Companions whether they knew who the muflis (poor one) was? They replied that among them the muflis was the person who had neither dirham nor goods. The Prophet, then, corrected them as follows:

> The poor one among my people is he who will bring on the day of resurrection prayer, fasting and zakāh, but will come having reviled this one, insulted that one, devoured the property of this one, shed the blood of that one and beaten this one. Then this one and that one will be given some of his good deeds; but if his good deeds are exhausted before he pays what he owes, some of their sins will be taken and cast upon him and he will be cast into hell.[2]

Abū Ḥanīfah, the Imam, says:

> Retaliation between opponents on the day of resurrection is a verity.[3]

ii. Al-Kulaynī's approach in regard to the doctrine of ṭīnah (clay or dust).

In principle the Shī'īs do not reject the doctrine of retaliation on the day of resurrection but they hold it as being restricted to those who believe in the Divine Imāmah of the Family of the Prophet. As regards the wrong which occurs between them and the men of other Faiths they believe that the last Judgement will be made on the basis of the particles of clay from which the men of various Faiths had been originated.

Al-Kulaynī reports 'Abd Allāh b. Kaysān as asking Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām:

1. ibid, v.8, p.139.
2. Muslim, op.cit., v.8, p.18.
3. Abū Ḥanīfah, op.cit., p.41 (with commentary of Abū al-Muntahā).

> In connection with trade and business I mix with the people and I see that there is a man of fine behaviour and polite manners who is a good trustee and when I enquire about him I find in him enmity for you; and there I see another man, of bad manners, who proves short in trust and wicked; and when I make enquiry about him I find in him friendship for you. How is it so?

The Imām answered as follows:

> Do you not know, O son of Kaysān! that God the Mighty and the Glorified took some clay (dust) from Paradise and some from hell and mixed both of them. Then he separated the clay (dust) of Paradise from the clay (dust) of hell, and this from that. So what you see in them (who have enmity for us) the trustworthiness, good manners and polite behaviour is due to the touch of the clay (dust) of Paradise and they will be restored to the origin from which they have been created and what you see in these (who have friendship for us) to be short in trust, wicked and having bad manners, is due to the touch of the clay (dust) of hell and they will also be restored to the origin from which they have been created.[1]

Al-Kulaynī further reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> If Belief is established no action does any harm as no deed benefits if there is unbelief.[2]
>
> Verily God defends those who do not offer prayer from among our Shīʿīs by those who do offer and if all of them give up the prayer they are destroyed. Verily God defends those who do not give zakāh from among the Shīʿīs by those who do give... and it is God's word: 'And were it not for God's repelling some men by others, the earth would certainly be in a state of disorder; but God is Gracious to the creatures.'[3] By God this verse was revealed only with reference to you and it does not imply anyone else.[4]

1. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.441.
2. ibid, v.2, p.464.
3. S 2:251.
4. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.2, p.451.

These traditions suggest that retaliation on the day of resurrection will not occur among all the Muslims but when the Shīʿīs report that there will be retaliation on that day they hold that it will affect only the men of their own belief. As regards the dealings with the other sects the doctrine of clay (dust) is the deciding factor. Al-Kulaynī has laid down three independent chapters on this issue, One of them is, 'The clay (dust) of the believer and the unbeliever.'[1]

10. Paradise and hell.

i. The question as to whether Paradise and hell are created or whether they will be created.

Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī (333 A.H.) introduces the issue as follows:

> We (the Sunnīs) believe that Paradise and hell are created (existing) and the Jahmīs and Muʿtazilīs say that they are not created as God is not unable to create them and He will create them when (on resurrection) the two parties will divide.[2]

Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (427 A.H.) explains it as follows:

> We agree to their (Paradise's and hell's) having been created with God's narration about Paradise: 'It has been prepared for those who guard against evil':[3] and His report about hell: 'It has been prepared for the unbelievers;'[4] and the reports, which the Qadarīs reject but which have attained celebrity in relation to the event of the Prophet's ascension to the heavens and, which in other explanations of Paradise and hell, bear evidence of their existence.[5]

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Al-Bukhārī lays down the two Chapter-headings as follows:

1. ibid, v.2, p.2.
2. Al-Māturīdī, Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar, p.28.
3. S 3:132.
4. S 2:24.
5. ʿAbd al-Qāhir, op.cit., p.238.

(i) What came in explanation of Paradise and that it is created....[1]

(ii) What came in explanation of hell and that it is created....[2]

Al-Bukhārī reports ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion (73 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> When anyone of you dies his abode (in Paradise or in hell) is shown to him morning and evening.[3]

Al-Bukhārī asks if Paradise and hell had not been created how would the abodes therein be shown to the deceased when they are in barzakh? He further reports ʿImrān b. Ḥuṣayn, the Companion (52 A.H.), as saying:

> I examined Paradise and I saw that most of its inhabitants were those who were poor (in this world) and I examined hell and I saw that most of its inhabitants were women.[4]

This report tells that Paradise and hell already exist and are created.

Al-Bukhārī gives another report in support of this belief that God told His Prophet:

> I have prepared for my upright servants what eye has not seen, nor any ear heard, nor has the thought of it entered the mind of any man.[5] (The Prophet said: Recite if you wish) 'No soul knows what is in store for itself of that which will refresh the eyes.'[6]

Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> (When the heat is severe) postpone the (second) prayer till it is cooler; for the violent heat comes from the bubbling over of hell.[7]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit, v.4, p.141.
2. ibid, v.4, p.145.
3. ibid, v.4, p.142.
4. ibid, v.4, p.142; v.8, p.141.
5. ibid, v.4, p.143; v.9, p.176.
6. S 32:17.
7. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.4, p.146.

Al-Bukhārī reports this tradition under the heading that hell is created and he argues that the relation between the two sorts of heat suggests that hell exists and is created.

Al-Tirmidhī reports Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> When God created Paradise and hell He sent Jibrīl to Paradise and said: 'Look at it and at what I have prepared for its inhabitants.' Jibrīl went and looked at it and what God had prepared in it for its inhabitants; he then came back and said, 'O my Lord by Your Might, no one who hears of it will fail to enter it....[1]

This report clearly states that Paradise and hell exist and are created.

(b) The approach of al-Kulaynī.

The Shī'īs disagree with the Mu'tazilīs on this issue and agree with the Sunnīs that Paradise and hell exist and are created. Al-Raḍī's agreement with the Mu'tazilīs is mentioned but it is not rightly traced back to him.

Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> Verily God, the Mighty and the Glorified, created Paradise before that He created hell; created obedience before that He created disobedience; created Mercy before that He created Wrath; created good before that He created bad; created the earth before that He created the heavens; created life before that He created death; created sun before that He created the moon and He created light before he created darkness.[2]

This report gives the series of all those things which exist and are created and there is evidence that Paradise and hell are created.

Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq Ibn Bābawayh (381 A.H.) reports that al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imām, was asked about Paradise and hell - 'Are they created?' The Imām answered in the affirmative and said:

1. Al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.92.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.145.

> Verily, the Prophet, on (the Night of) his ascension to heavens, had entered Paradise and looked at hell.[1]

He was further asked about the men (the Muʿtazilīs) who believe that Paradise and hell are predestined but do not yet exist. The Imām said:

> They are not ours nor are we theirs. One who does not believe in the creation of Paradise and hell has accused the Prophet and has accused us (the Imāms) of lying; and they are not our friends.[2]

Al-Majlisī gives a very comprehensive statement on this issue:

> Most of the scholastic theologians believe that Paradise and hell exist in actuality and they had been created in the very beginning of the creation of the world; and a few Muʿtazilīs say that at the resurrection they will be created; and it is not known whether any of the Shīʿīs might have agreed with this weak opinion. This has been ascribed to Sayyid Raḍī but it is not to be expected that he should have agreed with this opinion. Many verses of the Qurʾān bear evidence for their existence during the Qurʾān's revelation such as, 'And it has been prepared for those who guard against evil'; 'It has been prepared for those who believe'; 'It has been prepared for the unbelievers'; 'Near which is Paradise, the place to be resorted to'; and most of the traditions which mention the Prophet's ascension to the heavens report that the Prophet entered Paradise on the Night of his ascension and hell was shown to him.[3]

This statement bears evidence as to how the Sunnīs and Shīʿīs agree with each other on this issue and how both of them are at variance with the Muʿtazilīs and the Jahmīs.

ii. The ultimate allocation of Paradise and hell.

The Sunnīs believe that hell is created only for unbelievers, as the Qurʾān says: 'It has been prepared for the unbelievers';[4] and sinful believers, whose sins are

1. Al-Ṣuddūq, Amālī, p.413.
2. ibid, p.413.
3. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.281 (with ref. to S 3:133, S 57:21, S 2:24, S 53:15).
4. S 2:24.

more than their good deeds, and who have not been granted the intercession of the Prophet, will not remain forever in hell and will ultimately be taken out of it. But the Muʿtazilīs say that the one who is consigned to hell will remain in it forever whether he is an unbeliever or an unrepentant man who, in spite of believing in the Prophet, has committed a great sin. The Shīʿīs disagree with the Muʿtazilīs on this issue and agree with the Sunnīs that hell is created only for the unbelievers.

The Qurʾān says:

> 'God has promised to the believing men and the believing women gardens beneath which the rivers flow'.[1]
>
> 'Verily those who believe and do good deeds have the gardens of Paradise for a resting place.'[2]

Al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) comments:

> Similar statutes indicate that the believers are of the people of Paradise. This is in addition to the preceding definite arguments that the servant is not removed from Belief because of disobedience and that remaining forever in the Fire is the severest of the punishments. Since the Fire for ever has been made the recompense for Unbelief which is the greatest of the offences, if other than the unbeliever were to be so recompensed that would be more than their offence deserves and therefore an injustice to them.[3]

The Qurʾān does not narrate anyone coming out of hell after having been punished in it; and the Sunnī belief in this context is mostly based on traditions and on the theorists' approach to harmonise between the various verses of the Qurʾān.

Abū Manṣūr Abd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī (429 A.H.) gives a very comprehensive statement on this issue:

> For every verse in which there is a threat (against the evil deeds) there is a like verse in confrontation to it in which there is a promise for the good deeds. God's Word: 'And most surely the wicked are in burning fire'[4] contrasts with God's word:

1. S 9:72.
2. S 18:107.
3. Al-Taftāzānī, op.cit., p.150.
4. S 82:14.

> 'Most surely the righteous are in bliss';[1] and His Word: 'One who disobeys God...'[2] contrasts with His Word : 'One who obeys God.'[3] So when these verses contrast in threat and promise we particularise the verses in which there is threat from the verses in which there is a promise or we shall bring them into consistency (to show) that the sinful will be punished for a time and then will be forgiven and will enter Paradise for the reward (of his Belief) after he has had his full share of the chastisement; as it is not permissible that he might have been rewarded in Paradise and then be thrown into hell (for the punishment of his evil deeds).[4]

(a) The approach of al-Bukhārī.

Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī, the Companion (74 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> When the people of Paradise enter Paradise and the people of hell enter hell God will say, 'Bring forth those in whose hearts there is as much faith as a grain of mustard-seed.' They will then be brought forth burnt and turned to charcoal and be cast into a river of life, and they will sprout as does a seed in the rubbish carried away by a flood. Have you not seen that it comes out yellow and twisted.[5]

Al-Bukhārī reports 'Imrān b. Ḥuṣayn, the Companion (52 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet:

> People will come forth from hell by Muḥammad's intercession, and will enter Paradise and be named the Jahannamīs.[6]

Al-Bukhārī further reports Anas b. Mālik, the Companion (91 A.H.), as transmitting from the Prophet how he will intercede for his people. The Prophet says:

> When I see Him I shall fall down in prostration and God will leave me as long as He wishes to do so. He will then say, 'Rise, Muḥammad! If you

1. S 82:13; 83:22.
2. S 33:36.
3. S 4:69.
4. Abū Manṣūr 'Abd al-Qāhir, al-Tamīmī, op.cit., p.243.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.144; v.1, p.12.
6. ibid, v.8, p.145.

> make a request it will be granted. If you speak you will be listened to; and if you intercede it will be accepted.' I shall then raise my head and laud my Lord in a manner He will teach me. I shall then make intercession, but He will appoint a limit for me, after which I shall go out, bring them forth from hell and make them enter Paradise. I shall return the third or the fourth time and fall down in prostration as before, till there will remain in hell only those restrained by the Qurʾān. (Qatādah says 'those doomed to eternal punishment'). [1]

ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, the Companion (32 A.H.) reports that the Prophet said:

> I know the last of the inhabitants of hell to come out of it and the last of the inhabitants of Paradise to enter. He is a man who will come crawling out of hell and God will say, 'Go and enter Paradise'. When he comes out of it he will be thinking that it is full.... [2]

There are other traditions also by which al-Bukhārī argues that the sinful believers have ultimately to enter Paradise and that they have to endure punishment for their sins, and that then God by His Grace and Mercy will make them enter Paradise.

(b) <u>The approach of al-Kulaynī</u>.

We have already mentioned that the Shīʿīs disagree with the Muʿtazilīs on this issue and agree with the Sunnīs that no one other than the unbelievers will remain eternally in hell. They believe that the sinful believers, whatever great sin, apart from unbelief and associating someone with God, they may have committed, will enter Paradise by the Prophet's and the rightly guided men's interceding. But the Shīʿīs do not agree with the Sunnīs that interim entry to hell for some sinful believers is a verity and there are reports that on the basis of Belief they will be forgiven on the day of resurrection. But they also report some sinful believer's entry to hell and that they will finally be

1. <u>ibid</u>, v.8, p.145.
2. <u>ibid</u>, v.8, p.146.

forgiven through the Prophet's and Imāms' intercession. The Shīʿī approach on this issue is apparently contradictory and very much disputed. In one explanation of this issue they agree with the Sunnīs and in the other they depart from them, but in both of these explanations they disagree with the Muʿtazilīs.

The Shīʿīs' own dispute on this issue led the Shīʿī traditionists to be wavering. This anxiety and ambiguity seems to have led al-Kulaynī not to have explicitly discussed this matter and hence we refer to the other Shīʿī sources for the Shīʿī approach on this issue. Al-Majlisī gives a very comprehensive statement on this point:

> As regards the sinful (Twelve) Imāmī Shīʿīs who have committed great sins and have died without repentance (for their sins) it is undisputed among Shīʿī scholars that they will not remain eternally in hell; most of them would be allowed the intercession of the Prophet and of the Imāms and this has already been discussed. But the traditions are very much different and ambiguous as to whether some of them are accessible to hell's entrance and would not have been allowed the intercession of God's Prophet and the rightly-guided Imāms or as to whether any of them by the Grace of God would not be made to enter hell; and for their sins they would have the chastisement in this world, or at the time of death, or in the grave or in the affairs of the resurrection.[1]

Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (381 A.H.) reports ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, the Companion (50 A.H.), as stating that the Prophet said that he was shown in dreams various of his people in various wonderful states; and he said:

> I saw that a man fell into hell and there came (in a bodily form) his tears which he had shed fearing God's reproof and they brought him out of hell.[2]

This report suggests that sinful believers, after having some of the punishment of their evil deeds, will ultimately be taken out of hell. The Shīʿīs admit that the intercession of the Prophet will amount to the salvation of sinful believers who had committed great sins. ʿAlī b. Abū Ṭālib reports that

1. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.314.
2. Al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq, op.cit., p.205.

the Prophet says:

> God, the Mighty, the Glorious, bestowed upon me Fātiḥat al-Kitāb (the opening sūrah of the Qur'ān), the Call to prayer, the congregational prayer in the mosque, the Friday prayer, reciting aloud in three prayers, the concessions for my people when they are sick and when they are on a journey, the funeral prayer over the dead and the intercession for those of my people who have committed a great sin.[1]

Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd reports, with a rightly proved chain of transmitters, in Kitāb al-Zuhd that Muḥammad b. Muslim asked Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, about the Jahannamīyūn and the Imām replied on the authority of his father:

> They would have come out of hell. They will be then taken to a water-spring near the gate of Paradise. That water-spring will be known as 'the spring of life.' That water will be showered upon them and they will sprout in flesh, skin and hair as the grass grows.[2]

Ibān reports that the Imām further said:

> They will enter hell for their sins and will come out with God's Bounty.[3]

Al-Majlisī comments:

> The people who have been mentioned in these trustworthy traditions as coming out of hell and entering Paradise would be either sinful Shīʿīs who would have entered hell or they would be the mustaḍʿafūn (weak Muslims who on account of being under pressure had not accepted the Shīʿī Faith); and Ibn Bābawayh reports Imām Riḍā as writing for Ma'mūn, the ʿAbbāsī Caliph, on Islām: 'God will never make the believer enter hell as He has given promise to make him enter Paradise....; and the sinful believers will enter the Fire and will come out of it and intercession for them is permissible.'

ʿAbd Allāh b. Sinān reports that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, said:

> Anyone who commits a great sin and regards it to be lawful is beyond the pale of Islām and God will punish him with the severest punishment; and if he admits that what he has committed is forbidden and dies without repentance he comes out from belief but

1. ibid, pp.172, 572.
2. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.316.
3. ibid, p.317.

> does not come out beyond the pale of Islām, and punishment for him is less than the one mentioned first.[1]

As regards the sinful Shīʿīs, who do not leave behind Īmān (belief) in this way, al-Kulaynī reports, with rightly proved chain, al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as transmitting from God:

> Verily I shall punish every subject in Islām who believes in friendship with any unjust Imām that is not from God, however virtuous and pious he may be in his deeds; and I shall forgive every subject in Islām who believes in friendship with the just rightful Imām that is from God, however tyrannical and wicked he may be in his own person.[2]

Al-Kulaynī further reports Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, as saying:

> God does not feel ashamed of punishing the people who would have believed in (the friendship of) an Imām that is not from God however virtuous and pious he may be in his deeds and verily God feels ashamed of punishing the people who would have believed in (the friendship of) an Imām that is from God however wicked and tyrannical he may be in his deeds.[3]

These reports indicate that al-Kulaynī does not admit the sinful believers' entry to hell even for a short while whereas Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd explicitly reports some of them as entering hell and then coming out of it with the Prophet's and the Imāms' intercession.

Al-Majlisī regards the reports in this context as being different and ambiguous; he does not seem to have believed in the sinful Shīʿīs' interim entry to hell but does not elaborate this doctrine of his and concludes the issue as follows:

> There are many advantages in these differences and ambiguities; one of them is that the lustful people may not be misguided by the verses (of

1. ibid, p.320.
2. ibid, p.318.
3. ibid, p.318.

> the Qur'ān) and the traditions which suggest hope for their salvation and that they should remain in suspense between hope and fear and that is the most excellent attribute of a believer.[1]

iii. The joys of Paradise and the punishment of hell.

Life in the Hereafter whether it is in Paradise or in hell is everlasting and there will be requital of the virtuous and the wicked . The Qur'ān says:

> A likeness of the garden which the righteous are promised: there flow beneath it rivers, its fruits are perpetual in its plenteousness; this is the requital of those who guarded (against evil) and the requital of the unbelievers is the fire.[2]

(a) The eternity of Paradise and hell.

The Sunnīs agree that Paradise and hell remain existing for ever and that they will never perish; but the Jahmīs believe that Paradise and hell will also come to an end. Abū al-Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (429 A.H.) states:

> The Sunnīs and all the virtuous early scholars agree that Paradise and hell, the joys of the men of Paradise and the chastisement of the unbelievers in hell will remain enduring and a section of the Jahmīs holds that Paradise and hell shall pass away.[3]

Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (537 A.H.) corroborates this statement as follows:

> They (Paradise and hell) are continuing; they shall not pass away, nor shall their inhabitants pass away.

Al-Taftāzānī (791 A.H.) comments:

> They are everlasting; no perpetual non-existence befalls them, because of the statement of God in regard to both parties (that is, those of Paradise and those of hell), 'They abide forever in it.'[4] But as for what has been said about Paradise and hell being destroyed even for a moment in order to verify the statement of God that 'Everything perishes except His face',[5] this meaning is not

1. ibid, p.321.
2. S 13:35.
3. Abū al-Manṣūr Abd al-Qāhir al-Tamīmī, op.cit., p.238.
4. S 4:60, 121, 167.
5. S 28:88.

> inconsistent with their abiding. You will know that there is nothing in the verse to indicate passing away. The Jahmis took the position that both Paradise and hell and their inhabitants with them pass away. This is without doubt an unsound position contrary to the Qur'ān, the Sunnah and consensus[1]

This is one of those issues in which the Shī'īs agree with the Sunnīs and disagree with the Jahmīs. Muḥammad al-Bāqir al-Majlisī (110 A.H.) writes:

> It should be known that Paradise has eternity and security and there is agreement of the community that there will be no death therein.[2]

Al-Majlisī further states that those who do not believe in the eternity of Paradise have been declared unbelievers by some of the scholars.

(i) The Qur'ānic dictum.

The Qur'ān explains the eternity of Paradise and hell using the word abad which means forever, and it signifies time without end. The Qur'ān says:

> Surely (as for) those who disbelieve and act unjustly, God will not forgive them nor guide them to a path; except the path of hell, to abide in it forever and this is easy for God.[3]
>
> Surely God has cursed the unbelievers and has prepared for them a burning fire; to abide therein forever. They shall not find a protector or a helper.[4]
>
> Surely he shall have the fire of hell to abide therein forever.[5]

The Qur'ān states that they will never come out of hell:

> And they shall not come forth from the fire.[6]
>
> They would desire to go forth from the fire and they shall not go forth from it and they shall have an everlasting chastisement.[7]

1. Al-Taftāzānī, op.cit., p.140.
2. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.283.
3. S 4:168, 169.
4. S 33:64, 65.
5. S 72:23.
6. S 2:167.
7. S 5:37.

The Qur'ān mentions the joys of Paradise as being perpetual,[1] and that its inhabitants shall abide therein forever.[2] But the Jahmīs and those who agree with them argue that Paradise and hell will remain so long as the heavens and the earth endure. They refer to the following verse of the Qur'ān:

> Abiding therein (in the fire) so long as the heavens and the earth endure, except as your Lord please.[3]

The Qur'ān does not state that the heavens and the earth of that world are the same as of this world. Instead there are statements that on the Hour the heavens and the earth and everything shall perish and there is an indication in the Qur'ān that there will be a new phenomenon of the heavens and the earth of that world. The Qur'ān says:

> On the Day when the earth shall be changed into a different earth and the heavens as well, and they shall come forth before God, the One, the Supreme.[4]

(ii) The evidence of Sunnī tradition.

Al-Bukhārī believes that Paradise and hell are perpetual and that there is no end to the life of the hereafter. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, the Companion (73 A.H.), reports the Prophet as saying:

> When the men of Paradise enter Paradise and the men of hell enter hell then an announcer will make an announcement: 'O men of hell there is no other death to befall and O men of Paradise there is not another death to befall. There is perpetuity and not another death (end) to this life'.[5]

The word Khulūd (perpetuity) has been used here in comparison with the word death (or coming to an end); hence it signifies the meaning 'for ever' and not a long time. Al-Bukhārī reports in another discussion that Qatādah, the Successor (118 A.H.), establishes this perpetuity as wājib[6] (obligatory).

1. S 13:35.
2. S 4:122.
3. S 11:107.
4. S 14:48.
5. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.141.
6. ibid, v.8, p.145.

This approach of al-Bukhārī rejects the apparent meaning of the following report of Abū Umāmah, the Companion (86 A.H.):

> 'Surely a day will come over hell when it will be like a field of corn that has dried up and become fierce battering its doors'; and 'a day will come over hell when there shall not be a single human being in it who will be battering its doors'.[1]

This end of its restlessness may be interpreted as an outcome of the final declaration that there remains no one to be admitted to hell and there is no one who will further be brought out of it. Abū Hurayrah (57 A.H.) reports the Prophet as saying that hell will constantly ask 'Are there any more'[2] till God will place His Foot in it. It is possible that at that time the restlessness of hell would have come to an end. So the report of Abū Umāmah does not clearly state that hell itself would have come to an end. As regards the explanation of His Foot we have already discussed in the second chapter that the Sunnī traditionists do not allow the Nuʿūt of God to be interpreted.[3]

(iii) The evidence of Shīʿī tradition.

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the Sixth Imām, reports that when the men of Paradise entered Paradise and the men of hell entered hell, the death, being brought in the form of a ram, will be killed and then it will be announced:

> O men of Paradise! 'You will stay in Paradise forever' and O men of hell! 'You will stay in hell forever.'[4]

Al-Kulaynī reports the Prophet as giving Paradise the name of Dār al-Khulūd[5] where the men of Paradise will dwell forever.

(b) The nature of the joys of Paradise and the punishment of hell.

The Sunnīs and the Shīʿīs agree that the joys of Paradise

1. ʿAlī al-Muttaqī, Kanz al-ʿUmmāl, v.7, p.245.
2. S 50:30.
3. See, al-Tirmidhī, op.cit., v.2, p.92.
4. Al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.303.
5. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.3, p.257.

and the chastisement of hell are not merely abstracts but there will be corporal forms of reward and punishment. It is true that the quality and rank of the joys of Paradise are not adequately known but this fact does not preclude the nature of those joys being corporal. The Qur'ān says:

> So no soul knows what is in store for them of that which will refresh the eyes, a reward for what they did.[1]

The Qur'ān mentions the joys of Paradise as falling into two categories, the spiritual and the corporal. The spiritual joys are like happiness, quietness, observance of beauty and majesty and the corporal joys are like tasty food, excellent fruits, young girls and fine dresses. The Qur'ān explicitly states that there will be provision for both these categories of joys and delights in the best varieties. The frequent mention of these joys need hardly be referred to and suggests that they are not merely abstracts.

(i) <u>The approach of al-Bukhārī</u>.

Abū Hurayrah, the Companion (57 A.H.), reports the Prophet as transmitting from God the following <u>Ḥadīth Qudsī</u>:

> 'I have prepared for my upright servants what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor has it entered into the heart of man.'[2]

The Prophet then adds:

> Recite if you wish, 'No soul knows what comfort which refreshes the eyes has been concealed for them'.[3]

Abū Hurayrah further reports the Prophet as depicting the modes of the life in Paradise as follows:

> The first party to enter Paradise will be in the form of the moon on the night when it is full; then will come those who will be near them like the brightest shining planet in the sky, their hearts like one man's heart with no disagreement or mutual hatred among them. Every man among them will have two wives (from the large-eyed maidens) the marrow of whose legs will be visible

1. <u>S</u> 32:17.
2. Al-Bukhārī, <u>op.cit.</u>, v.4, p.143.
3. <u>S</u> 32:17.

> through the bone and the flesh owing to their slender beauty. They will glorify God morning and evening; they will not become ill, nor void excrement, nor spit. Their vessels will be of gold and silver, their combs will be of gold, the fuel of their braziers will be aloes and their sweat will be of musk.[1]

This tradition suggests that there will be glimpses of this world's life in that life but the qualities and modes of the joy of that life will exceed what the eyes of this world have ever seen and the ears of this world have ever heard.

(ii) The approach of al-Kulaynī.

Al-Kulaynī reports al-Bāqir, the Fifth Imām, as saying:

> When the men of Paradise enter Paradise and the men of hell enter hell, the Lord of Might will raise ʿAlī and he will make them dwell in their dwellings and he will make them marry their wives...; and he will close the door of Paradise when the men of Paradise have already entered therein.[2]

The Imām further states that there are various ranks of the men of Paradise. The Imām says:

> Verily Paradise has various ranks. Those who say right do not reach the rank of ones who do good and there are some who do not reach the rank of those who say right.[3]

Al-Kulaynī does not explain here those different ranks but al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (381 A.H.) explains, in his booklet on the Creed, the different categories of the men of Paradise as follows:

> There are some categories of the men of Paradise. There are some people who enjoy the pleasure of celebrating God's Sanctity, Glory, Purity and Greatness along with the angels. There are some who enjoy the pleasure of the varieties of food, drinks, fruits, the couches to sit on, the young maidens, the serving pages, the sitting on the thrones and the wearing of silk clothes of different kinds.[4]

1. Al-Bukhārī, op.cit., v.8, p.143.
2. Al-Kulaynī, op.cit., v.8, p.159.
3. ibid, v.8, p.228.
4. See, al-Majlisī, op.cit., p.223.

Al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (413 A.H.) rejects the opinion that there will be some who will be enjoying only the pleasure of celebrating God's Glory; and comments upon this statement of al-Shaykh al-Ṣuddūq (381 A.H.) as follows:

> The reward of the men of Paradise is that they enjoy pleasure of good food, drinks, fine sights and marriages...; and there will be no human being in Paradise who will be enjoying another sort of pleasure; and the statement of those who say that there will be some in Paradise who will enjoy the pleasure of celebrating God's Glory and Sanctity without eating and drinking is an isolated statement in Islām and it has been taken from the Christians who believe that those who worship God in this world will have the reward of having been changed into angels who do not take food nor take a drink nor enjoy the pleasure of going unto a wife; and God, the Exalted, has rejected this opinion of theirs.[1]

Al-Majlisī (1110 A.H.) does not agree with al-Mufīd and admits that there will be some whose only enjoyment there will be to have the pleasure of celebrating God's Glory. He states:

> In trustworthy traditions this opinion (of al-Shaykh al-Mufīd) does not stand proved... and I have given a little detail about this in my works <u>'Ayn al-Ḥayāt</u> and <u>Biḥār al-Anwār</u>.[2]

The Sunnīs and Shī'īs agree on this issue that the joys of Paradise will be of various categories and will be of the spiritual as well as of the corporal forms.

On most issues concerning <u>Al-Ākhirah</u> the Shī'īs disagree with the Jahmīs and the Mu'tazilīs even as they had agreed with them in most of the aspects of God's Attributes and in regard to the status of the Apostleship. There are two important points of agreement with the Mu'tazilīs. Firstly they agree regarding the question whether it is incumbent on the part of God to raise the dead or whether it is merely according to the commandment of God that the virtuous will be rewarded and the wicked will be punished. Secondly they agree regarding the point whether the chastisement in the grave is continuing after questioning or whether the dead body is

1. <u>ibid</u>, p.223.
2. <u>ibid</u>, p.223-4.

merely an inorganic matter after that. In one aspect of the second issue, the Shīʻīs differ from the Muʻtazilīs in so far as the latter do not believe in chastisement in the grave at all. The Shīʻīs disagree with the Sunnīs on these two issues although they are in agreement with them in most of the affairs of Al-Ākhirah. The Shīʻīs are distinct from all others on the doctrines of Rajʻah and Ṭīnah.

This comparative study of the principal doctrines of Islām indicates that the Apostleship and the Hereafter are the issues on which al-Bukhārī and al-Kulaynī are mostly in agreement, whereas the Imāmah and the Attributes of God are the issues on which they are mostly in disagreement. The Shīʻīs are distinct from all others on the issue of Imāmah, whereas the Sunnīs hold a distinct opinion in respect of the Attributes of God.

In the beginning the differences between these two main schools of Islām were not so developed but political considerations and later interpretations brought them further and further apart. The systematic presentation of ʻAlī's co-operation with his three predecessors is one of the interesting discoveries of this thesis and it provides a basis for the aforesaid contention.

As regards the doctrines concerning God, the Ṣifāt and the Nuʻūt of God have been discussed in comparison with each other. This provides material for a theme hitherto little developed in contemporary writings. The Ṣifah of Takwīn has also been discussed in an interesting sequence of the expression of God's Ṣifāt.

In regard to the Apostleship, the nature of the Apostles, their sinless status, Apostleship as being selection by God alone, and the nature of miracles are the outstanding issues that have been provided with detailed systematic references.

As to the Imāmah, the Shīʻī doctrine of Divine Imāmah has been dealt with in detail, and the Shīʻī outlook on the sinless status of the Imāms has been explored from the Shīʻī

corpus of Hadīth in a distinct form which has not hitherto been so elaborately discussed. The provision of taqīyah is the basic doctrine which harmonises Shī'ī dogma with their outlook on the co-operation of the Divine Imāms with the Sunnī Imāms who take charge of the Imāmah by election from among the public, nomination by their predecessors and selection from among a council.

On the issue of Al-Ākhirah the Shī'ī doctrines of raj'ah and ṭīnah have been introduced to the West in a comparative form. According to the Shī'īs it is in the Hereafter that there is complete realisation of the truth where there is no need of any taqīyah.

In the aforesaid areas of doctrines al-Kulaynī stands in confrontation to the Sunnīs, as at that stage (the fourth century of hijrah) the doctrinal differences had been developed, but al-Bukhārī, instead of facing the Shī'īs, stands in confrontation to the Jahmīs and the Mu'tazilīs with whom the Shī'īs are mostly in doctrinal agreement (with the exception of disagreement on the issue of Imāmah). This is on account of the fact that the Jahmīs and Mu'tazilīs were the strong living forces of that time, and not the Shī'īs, when al-Bukhārī compiled his work in the first half of the third century of the hijrah.

On the downfall of the Mu'tazilīs their principal doctrines could be studied in the living Shī'ī streams of thought. With this in mind, the comparative study of al-Bukhārī over against al-Kulaynī has been made in regard to the basic principles of Islām, although al-Bukhārī has not mentioned the Shī'īs in any discussion of his Al-Sahīh. On the other hand al-Kulaynī frequently mentions the Sunnīs and refutes them in principles as well as in applications.

This thesis provides a comparison of these two chief traditionists of the two main schools of Islām in respect of the basic principles (Usūl) and provides a background for work on the differences between the two schools in regard to the applications (furū') of Islām.

Bibliography.

I. TAFSĪR

ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī:
Tafsīr, Al-Najaf, 1386 A.H.

Furāt b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī:
Tafsīr, Al-Najaf, 1354 A.H.

Ibn Kathīr, ʿImād al-Dīn:
Tafsīr, Cairo, 1356 A.H.

Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ al-Kashānī:
Tafsīr Al-Ṣāfī, Teheran, 1375 A.H.

Qāḍī Thanā Allāh al-Fānīfatī:
Tafsīr Al-Mazharī, Delhi, 1384 A.H.

Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī:
Al-Fātiḥah, Hyderabad, 1310 A.H.

Al-Ṭabarsī, Abū ʿAlī:
Majmaʿ al-Bayān, (Syria), 1356 A.H.

Al- ʿUthmānī, Shabbīr Aḥmad:
Fawāʾid al-Qurʾān, Delhi, n.d.

II. ḤADĪTH

Abū Dāʾūd al-Sijistānī:
Kitāb al-Marāsīl, Karachi, 1369 A.H.
Al-Sunan, Karachi, 1369 A.H.

Abū al-Hasan ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā al-Irbīlī:
Kashf al-Ghummah, Qumm, 1381 A.H.

Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal:
Al-Musnad, Cairo, 1313 A.H.

ʿAlī al-Muttaqī:
Kanz al-ʿUmmāl, Hyderabad, 1312 A.H.

Al-ʿAynī, Badr al-Dīn:
ʿUmdat al-Qārī, Cairo, n.d.

Al-Bayhaqī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn:
Kitāb al- Asmāʾ wa al-Ṣifāt, Ilahabād, 1313 A.H.

Al-Bukhārī, Muhammad b. Ismāʾīl:
Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Cairo, 1345 A.H.

Al-Dārimī, Abū Muḥammad, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān:
Al-Sunan, Damascus, 1349 A.H.

Al-Ḥākim, Abū ʿAbd Allāh, al-Nīsāburī:
Al-Mustadrak, Hyderabad, 1334 A.H.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namarī al-Qurtubī:
Jāmiʿ Bayān al-ʿIlm, Medina, n.d.

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī:
Fatḥ al-Bārī, Bulaq, 1301 A.H.
Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr, Cairo, 1384 A.H.

Ibn Mājah, al-Qazwīnī:
Al-Sunan, Cairo, 1313 A.H.

Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf:
Al-Muʿtaṣar, Hyderabad, 1362 A.H.

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī:
Kitāb al-Kifāyah, Hyderabad, 1357 A.H.

Al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī:
Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ, Delhi, n.d.

Al-Khaṭṭābī, Abū Sulaymān:
Maʿālim al-Sunan, Aleppo, 1351 A.H.

Al-Kulaynī, Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb:
Al-Kāfī, Teheran, 1381 A.H.

Al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir:
Mirʾat al-ʿUqūl, (Īran,) 1321 A.H.

Al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Taqī:
Sharḥ al-Faqīh, (Iran,) 1331 A.H.

Mālik b. Anas:
Muwaṭṭaʾ, Cairo, 1348 A.H.

Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī:
Sharḥ Shamāʾil al-Tirmidhī, Cairo, n.d.

Muslim, Abū al-Ḥusayn, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj:
Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Cairo, 1330 A.H.

Al-Nasāʾī, Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān:
Al-Sunan, Delhi, n.d.

Al-Nawawī, Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā b. Sharaf:
Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Delhi, 1376 A.H.

Robson, Dr. James:
Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ (English Translation), Lahore, 1963 A.D.

Al-Shāh Walī Allāh al-Dihlawī:
Al-Musawwā Sharḥ Al-Muwaṭṭā, Delhi, 1293 A.H.

Al-Ṣuddūq, Abū Jaʿfar Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī:
Kitāb al-Amālī, Al-Najaf, 1389 A.H.
Kitāb al-Khiṣāl, (Iran,) 1302 A.H.
Maʿānī al-Akhbār, Teheran, 1379.

Al-Suyūtī, Jalāl al-Dīn:
Al-Jāmiʿ al-Ṣaghīr, Cairo, n.d.

Al-Ṭabarsī, Abū Manṣūr Aḥmad b. ʿAlī:
Kitāb al-Iḥtijāj, Al-Najaf, 1386 A.H.

Al-Tirmidhī, Abū ʿĪsā:
Al-Shamāʾil, Delhi, 1385 A.H.
Al-Sunan, (Turkey), 1291 A.H.

Al-Ṭūsī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Ḥasan:
Al-Istibṣār, Al-Najaf, 1376 A.H.
Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām, Teheran, n.d.

Al-ʿUthmānī, Shabbir Aḥmad:
Fatḥ al-Mulhim (Sharḥ) Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, India, n.d.

Al-Zaylaʿī, Jamāl al-Dīn:
Naṣb al-Rāyah, Cairo, 1357 A.H.

III. SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY (Kalām)

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Firhārwī:
Al-Nibrās (Sharḥ) Sharḥ al-ʿAqāʾid, Meerut (India) 1318 A.H.

Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī:
Kitāb al-Bayān, Beirūt, 1958 A.D.
Kitāb al-Tamhīd, Beirūt, 1957 A.D.

Abū Ḥanīfah, the Imām:
Fiqh al-Akbar, Hyderabad, 1321 A.H.
Kitāb al-Waṣīyah, Hyderabad, 1321 A.H.

Abū al-Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī al-Tamīmī:
Uṣūl al-Dīn, Istanbul, 1346 A.H.

Abū al-Muntahā Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Maghnīsawī:
Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar, Hyderabad, 1321 A.H.

Abū al-Thanā Shams al-Dīn al-Isfahānī:
Maṭāliʿ al-Anẓār, Khayrīyah (Egypt), 1323 A.H.

Abū Yaʿqūb Isḥāq al-Ismāʿīlī al-Sijistānī:
Ithbāt al-Nabūʾāt, Beirut, 1966 A.D.

A.J. Wensinck:
The Muslim Creed, Cambridge, 1932 A.D.

Al-Ashʿarī, Abū al-Ḥasan:
Kitāb al-Ibānah, Hyderabad, 1321 A.H.
Maqālāt, Istanbul, v.1, 1929 A.D., v.2, 1930 A.D.

ʿIyāḍ al-Qāḍī:
Al-Shifāʾ, Cairo, n.d.

Al-Bayḍāwī, al-Qāḍī:
Ṭawāliʿ al-Anwār, Khayrīyah (Egypt), 1323 A.H.

De Boer:
The History of Philosophy in Islām, ~~Luzac~~ (London), 1933 A.D.

E.E. Elder:
Introduction to Commentary on the Creed of Islām, New York, 1950, A.D.

Al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid:
Al-Iqtiṣād fī al-I'tiqād, Cairo, 1320 A.H.

Al-Ḥakīm al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥasan:
Tajrīd al-I'tiqād, Qumm, 1271 A.H.

Al-Ḥillī, Ibn al-Muṭahhar:
Kashf al-Murād (Sharḥ) Tajrīd al-I'tiqād, Qumm, 1271 A.H.

Al-Jurjānī, al-Sayyid al-Sharīf:
Sharḥ al-Mawāqif, Sa'ādat (Egypt), 1325 A.H.

Al-Khayyāṭ, Abū al-Ḥusayn 'Abd al-Raḥīm:
Kitāb al-Intiṣār, Beirut, 1957 A.D.

Al-Majlisī, Muḥammad al-Bāqir:
Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, Lucknow, 1300 A.H.

Al-Māwardī, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad:
A'lām al-Nabūwah, Cairo, 1330 A.H.

Mullā 'Alī al-Qārī:
Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar, Kanpur (India), 1345 A.H.

Mullā Ḥusayn b. Iskandar:
Al-Jawharat al-Munīfah, Hyderabad, 1321 A.H.

Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī:
Minhāj al-Nijāt,(Iran,)1303 A.H.

Al-Nasafī, Abū Ḥafṣ Najm al-Dīn:
'Aqā'id, Charbarli Tash (Turkey), 1326 A.H.

Nawwāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān:
Bughyat al-Rā'id, Bhupal, 1301 A.H.

Ṣadr al-Dīn:
Sharḥ 'Aqīdat al-Ṭaḥāwīyah,(Egypt,)n.d.

Al-Sālimī, Abū al-Shakūr:
Al-Tamhīd fī Bayān al-Tawḥīd, Ḥiṣār Fayrozah (India) 1269 A.H.

Al-Taftāzānī, Sa'd al-Dīn Mas'ūd:
Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id, Charbarli Tash (Turkey),1326 A.H.

IV. BIOGRAPHIES.

Al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn:
Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ, Hyderabad, 1333 A.H.

Ibn Abd al-Barr al-Namarī al-Qurṭubī:
Al-Istī'āb, Hyderabad, 1337 A.H.

Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī:
Iṣābah, Egypt, 1323 A.H.
Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb, Hyderabad, 1325 A.H.

Ibn Sa d
Al - Tabaqāt, Leiden, 1335 A.H.

Al-Kashshī, Abū ‘Amr Muḥammad b. ‘Umar:
Rijāl al-Kashshī, Karbalā/Najaf, n.d.

Al-Khawānsārī, Mirza Muhammad Bāqir:
Rawḍāt al-Jannāt, Teheran, 1304 A.H.

Al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir:
Jilā'al ‘Uyūn, Teheran, 1334 A.H.
Ḥayāt al-Qulūb, Teheran, 1374 A.H.

Al-Māmaqānī, ‘Abd Allāh:
Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl, (Iran) 1349 A.H.

Al-Najjāshī:
Rijāl al-Najjāshī, Bombay, 1371 A.H.

Al-Nawawī, Muḥy al-Dīn:
Tahdhīb al-Asmā' wa al-Lughāt, Cairo, n.d.

Al-Nawbakhtī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā:
Firaq al-Shī‘ah, Najaf, 1355 A.H.

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shustarī:
Majālis al-Mu'minīn, Teheran, 1375 A.H.

Al-Subkī, Tāj al-Dīn:
Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyat al-Kubrā, Cairo, 1324 A.H.

V. FIQH and UṢŪL

Abū Yūsuf al-Qāḍī:
Kitāb al-Kharāj, Cairo.

‘Alā al-Dīn:
Al-Durr al-Mukhtār, Istanbul, 1307 A.H.

Ibn ‘Ābidīn, al-Shāmī:
Radd al-Muḥtār, Istanbul, 1307 A.H.

Ibn Hammām al-Iskandarī:
Al-Taḥrīr, (Egypt) 1351 A.H.

Muḥammad b. Hasan al-Shaybānī:
Siyar al-Kabīr, Hyderabad, 1335 A.H.

Al-Sarakhsī:
Sharḥ Siyar al-Kabīr, Hyderabad, 1335 A.H.

Al-Shāfi‘ī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs:
1 Khtilāf al-ḥadīth, Bulaq, 1326 A.H.
Kitāb al-Umm, Bulaq, 1326 A.H.
Risālah, Bulaq, 1326 A.H.

VI. TA'RIKH

Browne, E.G.:
A Literary History of Persia, Cambridge, 1930 A.D.

Ibn Kathīr ‘Imād al-Dīn:
Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, Cairo, 1351 A.H.

Ibn Khaldūn, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maghribī:
Muqaddamah, Karachi, n.d.

Al-Khatib al-Baghdadi:
Ta'rikh Baghdad, Cairo, 1349 A.H.

K. Hitti:
History of the Arabs, London, 1937 A.D.

R.A. Nicholson:
A Literary History of the Arabs, London, 1923 A.D.

Sa'id Nafisi:
Muqaddamah Nathr Farsi Mu'asir, Teheran, n.d.

Al-Tabari, Ibn Jarir:
Ta'rikh al-Rusul wa al-Muluk, Leiden, 1881 A.D.

VII. GENERAL

Abu Yusuf al-Qadi:
Kitab al-Kharaj.

Ahmad Sirhindi:
Mabda' wa Ma'ad, Delhi, 1311 A.H.
Maktubat, Lucknow, n.d.

A.J. Arberry:
The legacy of Persia, Oxford, 1953 A.D.

Al-Dhahabi, Shams al-Din:
Manaqib Abu Hanifah, Cairo, 1366.

Goldziher:
Muslim Studies, London, 1971 A.D.

Guillaume:
The Traditions of Islam, 1924 A.D.

Al-Hilli Ibn al-Mutahhar:
Minhaj al-Karamah, Berrut, 1382 A.H.

Ibn 'Abd al-Barr:
Jami' Bayan al- 'Ilm,
Kitab al-Intiqa, Cairo, 1350.

Ibn Qaiyim al-Jawzi:
Kitab al-Ruh, Hyderabad, 1324 A.H.
'Ilam al-Muqi'in, Cairo, 1325 A.H.

Ibn Shahr Ashub, Rasbid al-Din, Abu Ja'far:
Ma'alim al- 'Ulum a; Teheran.

Ibn Taymiyah:
Minhaj al-Sunnah, Berrut, 1382 A.H.
Sharh hadith al-Nuzul, Cairo, n.d.

Ibrahim b. Musa al-Gharnati al-Shatibi:
Kitab al-I'tisam, Cairo, n.d.
Al-Muwafaqat, Al-Tajari yat al-Kubra (Cairo) n.d.

Nu'man Afandi, Khayr al-Din Abu al-Barakat:
Ghaliyat al-Mawa'iz, Cairo, n.d.

Al-Qalqashandī, al-Shaykh Abū al- ʿAbbās Aḥmad:
Subḥ al-Aʿshā, Cairo, 1340 A.H.

Al-Sayyid Ḥayder al-Āmulī:
Jāmiʿ al-Asrār, Teheran, 1347 A.H.

Schacht:
An Introduction to Islamic Law, Oxford, 1971 A.D.
Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, Oxford, 1950 A.D.

Al-Shāh ʿAbd al- ʿAzīz al-Muḥaddith al-Dihlawī:
Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAsharīyah, Lucknow, n.d.

Al-Shāh Walī Allāh al-Muhaddith al-Dihlawī:
Ḥujjat Allāh al-Bālighah, Bulaq, 1284 A.H.
Qurrat al- ʿAynayn, Delhi, n.d.
Al-Tafhīmāt al-Ilāhīyah, Sūrat (India), n.d.

Al-Shaʿrānī, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb:
Al-Yawāqīt wa al-Jawāhir, Cairo, n.d.

Al-Shaykh al-Akbar Muḥy al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿArabī:
Al-Futūḥāt al-Makkīyah, Berrut, n.d.

Al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn:
Al-Khaṣāʾiṣ al-Nabawiyat al-Kubrā, Hyderabad, 1319 A.H.